

THE SCHOOL REVIEW

A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

VOLUME XXIII

JUNE 1915

NUMBER 6

THE BEGINNINGS OF PUBLIC EDUCATION IN NEW ENGLAND.—*Continued*

MARCUS W. JERNEGAN
University of Chicago

II

The terms "public school" and "free school" have had various meanings historically. In many cases the English endowed grammar schools were "public" only in the sense that they were open to all classes, and "free" only for a limited number of pupils. When these terms were transferred to New England they were used sometimes as in England, and at other times in a quite different sense. In tracing the evolution of our system of public education in this chapter, we are concerned primarily with the action of New England towns in their corporate capacity, as the inhabitants voted in town meeting respecting the establishment, management, and support of town schools. A public school in this sense involved, first, establishment by the town; that is, either initiating it by vote in town meeting, or taking over a private school; second, management by the town either directly or by delegating power to the selectmen or appointed committees; third, support by means of town property—often public lands set aside as an endowment for schools, or funds obtained by taxes levied on all or a portion of the property in the town. It will be seen later that the early history of public schools shows many combinations involving

mixed systems of public and private establishment, management, and support. There were of course other agencies for education besides town schools, such as privately endowed schools, private schools, private tutors, education through the apprenticeship system, and parental education. But such agencies are reserved for future treatment.

Although some of the essential principles of our public-school system were in operation in New England before 1647, it is difficult to determine precisely their origin and evolution. At this date there were six separate colonies,¹ containing at least sixty towns,² in all stages of development. Some were mere clearings in the forest—small frontier settlements; others were in a later period of growth, but still in the early stages of their institutional beginnings, with a population of perhaps thirty or forty families each, or even less. Scarcely one-third of the towns could have had as many as one hundred or more families, and nearly all of these were situated on or near the coast.³ How many are known to have established and supported town schools before 1647?

¹ Namely, Plymouth, Massachusetts Bay, Connecticut, New Haven, Rhode Island, and Maine. New Hampshire was absorbed by Massachusetts in 1641 and continued under her jurisdiction until 1679. Maine was also absorbed by Massachusetts in 1652. The date 1647 is taken, because on November 11, 1647, Massachusetts passed an act compelling towns of a certain population to set up town schools. (*Rec. Co. Mass. Bay*, II, 203.)

² Massachusetts Bay had 32, Plymouth 10, Connecticut 9, New Haven 5, and Rhode Island 4. There were other settlements, which are not included in this list. Maine had a number, such as York, Saco, and Wells; but some were not governed as towns, and in the case of others records are lost, so that we have no evidence of town action on schools in Maine before 1647. There were also in Massachusetts "plantations" or settlements consisting of a small number of families, sometimes governed by the General Court, but which later became full-fledged towns with all the powers of self-government. (See Hubbard, "Hist. of New Eng.," *Mass. Hist. Soc. Collec.*, 2d ser., VI, 416-17, for illustration.) Compare also, Lechford, *Plaine Dealing*, etc. (ed. by Trumbull), who speaks of "farmes or villages," pp. 40-41, 106-107. Lechford was a lawyer who resided at Boston, 1638-41. For a list of towns, with dates, for Massachusetts, and Plymouth, see C. D. Wright, *Rept. on Custody and Cond. of Pub. Rec. of Mass.* (1889), pp. 149-303. See also the list in "Good News from New England" (London, 1648), *Mass. Hist. Soc. Collec.*, 4th ser., I, 212. This contains the towns and pastors, with their salaries.

³ Population statistics of towns in this period can be gleaned only incidentally from the town records and histories.

The principal original sources for this information are town records. But here, as is often the case, the historian is confronted with records that are unsatisfactory. Some are missing, others imperfect, and still others survive as incomplete copies of originals. We thus have good reasons for believing that surviving records reveal the minimum rather than the maximum extent of the educational activity of the towns in this period. Nevertheless we must base our conclusions only on evidence supported by existing data. With respect to Massachusetts it appears that out of thirty-two towns established, the records of at least six are entirely missing for this period, while others are imperfect. Of the twenty-six towns which have records, nineteen fail to record action on schools before 1647. This leaves only seven in which there is a record of a town vote on this subject.¹ In New Haven Colony we find only two towns, in Connecticut only one, and in Rhode Island only one, in which there are votes concerning schools. Not a single town in Plymouth Colony, Maine, or New Hampshire, either before or after it came under the jurisdiction of Massachusetts, took action before the date in question.² We have then only eleven towns to consider.³

There are many interesting questions concerning the origin of certain features of our public-school system. For example, one would like to know which town first established and opened a public school, and supported it in whole or in part out of public property or by the levy of a tax on a portion or all of the property-holders; which first appointed a schoolmaster and fixed his salary, or established a school committee; which first made the school free in part, or for all classes, etc. Then there are other

¹ See below for each of these towns.

² There was one town in Plymouth Colony, Rehoboth, that gives some evidence of action. The proprietors, in granting land and drawing lots, allowed "The Schoolmaster" a portion. In 1643 his part is recorded as worth £50; in 1644 Lot No. 8 was assigned to him, and in 1645 Lot No. 49. But nothing further is known concerning the actual opening of a school. (Bliss, *Hist. of Rehoboth*, pp. 23-34.) The town of Plymouth made no provision for a town school until May 20, 1672. See *Rec. Town of Plymouth*, I (1636-75), 115, 124. See also Bradford, *Hist. Plymouth Plantation* (1606-1646), ed. by W. T. Davis, p. 170.

³ There are a few other towns that have a claim, but the evidence is so scanty and inconclusive that they are omitted from this discussion.

questions such as those involving the development of administration, supervision, and support; the content of the curriculum, and the means taken to make public education effective and general.

But there are numerous difficulties which hinder satisfactory answers to such questions besides the lack of complete data already mentioned. Would a mere proposal for a town school, or the date set for its opening, or proof that it was actually in operation, mark the date of its establishment? A school might be established by a vote in a regular town meeting, but its support and management remain wholly in private hands; or it might be privately established and receive occasional aid from the town. Would a voluntary contribution, decided upon in a town meeting, but unenforced, warrant the assertion that a school had been established by the town and was supported by public taxation? Is it proper to speak of a "free school" which was free only to the poor, or which derived a considerable portion of its support from tuition fees? In the brief account of the eleven schools which follows there will be illustrations of these problems. We shall consider what educational principles were established and endeavor to award credit to the towns which were responsible for them.

April 13, 1635, the town of Boston voted that "our brother Philemon Pormont, shalbe intreated to become scholemaster, for the teaching and nourtering of children with us." With no subsequent vote on this particular matter, we cannot assert that the school was opened, or, if opened, that it was supported by the town.¹ Indeed there is no vote respecting a town school for nearly seven years.² January 10, 1641/2, it was voted, at a general town meeting, that "Deare" Island, granted to the town by the General

¹ "Second Rept. Rec. Com.," *Boston Town Rec.* 1634-60, p. 5.

² A meeting of the "richer inhabitants" of Boston was held August 12, 1636, when a subscription amounting to £39 6s. 10d. was made by forty-five persons, named, for maintaining a "free schoomaster for the youth with us, Mr. Daniel Maud being now also chosen thereunto." This record was copied into the town records at the end of the volume. It really has no official place there, as it is not a record of a town meeting, and support of a school by voluntary subscription cannot in any sense be called town support. (See "Second Rept. Rec. Com.," *op. cit.*, p. 165.) Mr. Maud was granted a garden plot April 17, 1637, and Mr. Pormont a tract of land January 8, 1637/8 (*ibid.*, pp. 16, 25). The latter left Boston very soon after, and went to Exeter, New Hampshire (Belknap, *Hist. of N.H.*, I, 37).

Court in 1634/5,¹ should be improved "for the maintenance of a free schoole for the Towne" or for other purposes, "the sayd schoole being sufficiently Provided for."² The island was not rented until December 30, 1644, and then for three years only at the rate of £7 a year.³ These votes mark a change in policy on the part of the town, and show that the previous method of support had become unsatisfactory. The principle of granting public land as a permanent endowment for education had been one of the main sources of support in England, and was now being tried out in New England, in several towns, even before Boston adopted the plan. A few weeks before the vote to rent the island, the selectmen, at one of their meetings, ordered the constables to pay to Deacon Eliot (one of the selectmen) for Mr. Woodbridge, "eight pounds⁴ due to him for keeping the Schoole the Last yeare."⁵ This also indicates a change of policy and shows that the town was assuming more responsibility for support of the school. It is uncertain from what source this money came, though the order seems to indicate some contract with the schoolmaster, whereby the town through the selectmen had agreed to grant him a stipulated sum, perhaps in part payment for his services. The money was probably drawn from general funds obtained by taxes levied for town purposes.⁶ Yet it is possible that it represents a voluntary contribution, collected by the constables. Winthrop has a note on school support

¹ March 4, 1634/5. *Rec. Co. Mass. Bay, I*, 139.

² "Second Rept. Rec. Com.," *op. cit.*, p. 65.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 82. This order was passed at a meeting of the selectmen. On January 31, 1641/2, the town granted the use of the land to Captain Gibones "until the Towne doe let the same" (*ibid.*, p. 65).

⁴ *Ibid.*, December 2, 1644. Thus the year December 2, 1643, to December 2, 1644, is the first in which there is evidence that support of the school came from town funds.

⁵ On October 27, 1645, the selectmen ordered the constables to "sett off six shillings of Henry Messenger's Rates" for mending the "Schoole Masters fence" ("Second Rept. Rec. Com.," *op. cit.*, p. 86). This appears to be an order similar to that of December 2, 1644, and both indicate the beginnings of support by taxation.

⁶ The selectmen decided on the town rate and then gave orders to the constables to pay certain sums due, out of the money collected. For example, on July 25, 1644, the constables were ordered to pay £4 10s to Arthur Perry, part of £7 due him for his services in drumming. Similar payments were ordered at this same meeting ("Second Rept. Rec. Com.," *op. cit.*, p. 80).

under date July 3, 1645, which has often been quoted, but part of which is not confirmed by other evidence. His version is: "Divers free schools were erected as at Roxbury (for maintenance whereof every inhabitant bound some house or land for a yearly allowance forever) and at Boston (where they made an order to allow forever 50 pounds to the master and an house, and 30 pounds to an usher, who should also teach to read and write and cipher, and Indians' children were to be taught freely, and the charge to be yearly by contribution, either by voluntary allowance, or by rate of such as refused, etc., and this order was confirmed by the general court . . .). Other towns did the like, providing maintenance by several means."¹ Neither the town records of Boston nor those of the selectmen contain any such order, nor is there any such reference in the records of the General Court at this date; nor is there any evidence of the appointment of an usher, or more than one teacher, until 1666.² An order was made in 1650 to pay "Mr. Woodmansey, the Schoolmaster," £50 by rate, but no usher is mentioned.³ There is therefore doubt concerning Winthrop's statements. Apparently he has confused events of a later date with those of 1645 or before. It should be noted that he says nothing of the rental of Dear Island, which according to the town's vote of three years before might be improved for the use of the school, and which was actually rented six months before the date of Winthrop's entry.

The evidence submitted fails to show that the town of Boston appropriated any funds for the support of the school between 1635 and December 2, 1643. We are therefore forced to the conclusion that its support must have been from private sources, and that Mr. Pormont and Mr. Maud, assuming that the school was in operation in this period, were maintained in the manner common in such cases, by contributions⁴ and tuition fees.

¹ Winthrop, *Journal*, etc., ed. by Hosmer, II, 224. Winthrop's failure to mention the School at Boston until 1645 is significant.

² "Rept. of Rec. Com.," *Boston Town Records (1660-1701)*, March 26, 1666, p. 30. In the list of ushers of the school the first mentioned is Mr. Hinchman, appointed in 1666 by the above vote. (H. F. Jenks, *Cat. of Bost. Pub. Lat. Sch.*, p. 16.)

³ "Second Rept. Rec. Com.," *op. cit.*, March 11, 1650, p. 99.

⁴ Compare Jenks, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

On June 3, 1636, the town of Charlestown voted as follows: "Mr Wm Witherell was agreed with to keepe a schoole for a twelve monthe" to begin August 8, and have £40 "this year."¹ February 12, 1637/8, a committee was appointed by the town to settle Mr. Witherell's wages "for the yeare past in pt. and pt. to come."² These two items indicate that the town established, opened, and supported a town school. The agreement is definite, including the salary and the date of beginning and ending the service—a full year. The town assumed responsibility for payment of the salary, and appointed the first committee (the germ of the school committee) in any New England town to manage school affairs. The power to settle the wages due for work already done and work to be done is good evidence that the school had been in operation for a considerable period and was to be continued.³ If kept a year from August 8, 1636, as the first vote provided, and for the "yeare past," viz., from August 8, 1637, as the second vote indicates, the school would have been in continuous operation for eighteen months. No other New England town can show as good evidence as Charlestown on these points within the dates mentioned. The exact method of raising the salary is not mentioned, but both votes indicate that the money was collected and administered by officials appointed by the town. On January 20, 1646/7, the town adopted a more complex system of support. It was agreed "that A Rate" of £15 should be "gathered of the Town towards

¹ *Charlestown Archives*, Vol. XX; *MS Town Records*, II (1629-1664), 11. (See Frothingham, *Hist. of Charlestown*, pp. 1-3, for comment on the early MS records of the town, which are copies of originals now lost.) Mr. Witherell was granted a house plot February 11, 1636/7, had a house, as recorded, March 3, 1637, participated in a division of land April 23, 1638, and sold his house December 28, 1638 (*Chas. Archives*, pp. 11, 13, 18-19, 21). Sometime in 1638 he removed to Duxbury (Winsor, *Hist. of Duxbury*, pp. 263, 346).

² *Chas. Archives*, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

³ This record is of unusual importance, and was omitted by Mr. Frothingham in the account of the school in his history of Charlestown. It reads: "About Mr Witherell it was referred to Mr Greene & Wm. Lerner to settle his wages for the yeare past in pt and pt to come, & they chose Ralph Sprague for A third." In the margin is written, "To provide of settling ye Grammer Schoolemers Sallary" (*Chas. Archives*, *op. cit.*, p. 17). Mr. Lerner was one of the selectmen, Mr. Greene the ruling elder of the church, and Mr. Sprague was a prosperous farmer and had been a member of the first board of selectmen. (Frothingham, *op. cit.*, pp. 79, 81, 51-2.)

the schoole for this year"; secondly, that £5 due the town for rent of Lovell's Island should be paid for the use of the school by the town; thirdly, that the town's part of "Misticke Ware" should be appropriated "for the Schoole forever."¹ This vote is important, for it is the first recorded in Massachusetts which provides for raising a definite sum by rate; viz., by taxation to be levied, presumably as other taxes, on all property-holders. In the margin of the record we find the words, "Allowance granted for the Towne Schoole";² additional evidence of the use of this important principle of school support. It should be noted also that Charlestown voted to open her school August 8, 1636. There is no evidence that the Boston vote of 1635 resulted in the opening of a school. Moreover, the date of the subscription for a free school was August 12, 1636, with no proof of the date when it was opened. Therefore the date set for the opening of the Charlestown School was four days before the meeting of the richer inhabitants of Boston, who subscribed for a free school. Note also that the vote of Charlestown was taken in town meeting more than three months before this agreement of private individuals was made.

On May 20, 1639, the town of Dorchester voted to impose an annual rent of £20 forever on "Tomson's" Island,³ to be paid by every person having property there and proportionate to the amount held by each, toward the maintenance of a school. The sum mentioned was to be paid to a schoolmaster, chosen by the freemen, to teach "English, latin and other tongues, and also writing." The elders and seven men (selectmen) were given power to decide whether "maydes shalbe taught with the boyes or not."

¹ Chas. Archives, *op. cit.*, p. 36. Lovell's Island was granted the town by the General Court, October 28, 1636 (*Rec. Co. Mass. Bay, I*, 183). "Misticke Ware" referred to a fishery in which the town had a share. Lovell's Island seems to have been rented for twenty years, and the income applied for the support of the school (see Frothingham, *op. cit.*, p. 65). In 1636 there were seventy-two men in Charlestown with wives and children (*ibid.*, p. 98). Rates had been levied by the town for the colony tax since 1630 (*ibid.*, p. 99).

² Chas. Archives, *op. cit.*

³ Granted by the General Court, March 4, 1634/5 (*ibid.*, p. 39). The land was divided, but just what proportion of the inhabitants held shares is unknown. See *Hist. of Dorchester* (By a Com. of Dorch. Ant. and Hist. Soc.), p. 419. "Fourth Rept. Rec. Com., *Dorch. Town Rec. 1633-1689*," pp. 30-31 (apportionment of "other land," dated March 18, 1637/8).

A refusal to pay the rent imposed subjected the owner to a levy by distress or a forfeit of his land.¹ On February 7, 1641-2, because of the difficulty of collecting rent from no less than "Sixscore or therabout," and because the rent when collected was not alone "sufficient maintenance for a Schoole, without some addicon thereunto," the owners bequeathed the island to the town, "Towards the Maintenance of a free schoole in Dorchester aforsayd for the instructinge & Teachinge of Children & Youth in good literature and Learninge."² It was to be let to not more than ten persons, by the inhabitants or their agents, for its full value; and the sum realized was to be paid only for the use of the schoolmaster, a condition stipulated by the donors. On March 14, 1645, rules and orders were presented to the town for the government of the school and confirmed.³ Three men, called wardens or overseers, chosen by the town for life, were made a permanent committee to manage the school; viz., to collect and lay out its income and account for the same to the town, supply the schoolmaster, with the consent of the town, pay his wages, and keep the schoolhouse in repair. The support was to come from the "school stock," or in case of need the wardens might "repayre to the 7 men of the Towne for the time being who shall have power to taxe the Towne," to an amount sufficient to pay for the repair of the schoolhouse. They were to provide firewood for the school and tax the scholars for this purpose. Finally they were to see that the schoolmaster instructed all pupils sent to him, whether their parents were "poore or rich not refusing any who have Right and Interest in the Schoole."⁴

The vote of 1639 thus provided for a permanent school, with the amount and method of support definitely fixed. The town did not grant its own public land or provide for the taxation of persons

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

² This document is printed in *Hist. of Dorchester*, pp. 422-24. It is signed by seventy-one persons, and a facsimile of their signatures is given by Orcutt, *Good Old Dorchester*, p. 292, and by Blake, *Annals of Dorchester*.

³ "Fourth Rept. Rec. Com.," *op. cit.*, pp. 54-57.

⁴ In the rules and orders there are interesting regulations set forth respecting the length of the school year and sessions, religious instruction, including catechizing, morals, manners, and discipline. In general the wardens were to see that the master trained up the children of the town in "religion, learning and Civilitie."

who might later become inhabitants of the town. Indeed the levy did not fall necessarily on all the property-holders in the town at this date. It may be regarded as a voluntary contribution from those holding the land in question, or a forced contribution imposed on all the owners of the land by a majority vote in town meeting. In either case the owners were bound by the town vote to pay the contribution even if later they were disinclined to keep the agreement. It is perhaps reasonable to call this a species of public support, especially in view of the fact that refusal to pay subjected the owner to a levy by distress or forfeiture, as in the case of failure to pay other taxes, and because a large number of the inhabitants held the land in question. But the case lacks certain of the important elements of real public support. On the other hand, however, we must bear in mind that this plan was a failure. The deed of gift, February, 1642, by the proprietors of the island, was a voluntary contribution, and its tendency was to relieve property-holders to some extent of a possible annual tax for school support, since the income from the rent of the island was to be used for the main support of the school. This gift was not made by a vote in town meeting, but was a bequest of land owned by certain individuals. Although there were at least 120 who had rights in the island at this date, only seventy-one signed the document (about 60 per cent of those who were owners) conveying the land to the town. Between 1642 and 1647, then, the school at Dorchester was a privately endowed school, not supported by public taxation, and not even endowed by the town with its own property.¹ The gift was made necessary because of neglect or refusal of some to pay their dues, and perhaps the disinclination of the town to levy by distress. No provision was made by the town within these dates for additional income, except the right of the selectmen to lay a tax for the repair of the schoolhouse if requested to do so by the wardens. We have no evidence that such a tax was laid. Indeed, there seems to have been little inclination to raise money by taxation, even after the town lost the island in 1648 by a decision

¹ The distinction between town land, viz., undivided land owned by the town as a corporate body, and divided land, viz., land owned by individuals, is important. Even if every inhabitant possessed land on the island and then conveyed it to the town, it would not be endowment by the town, but by individuals.

of the General Court. In a petition (1648) for more land, the town complained that the school was "like to faile" for want of land to support it.¹ The school was a town school, because managed by the town. It was public, open to all classes, and, in theory at least, was free. But provision was made for a tax on pupils for firewood, and the complaint in 1648 that the school was "like to faile" does not indicate that town support had developed much by that date. We have no record of the amount received from the rental of "Tomson's" Island, but, as has been seen, Dear Island, Boston, was let at only £7 in 1644, and Lovell's Island, Charlestown, for £5, apparently, in 1647. It is quite possible even that tuition fees or gifts were resorted to, to help support the school in this period.

The method of management by a permanent committee, wardens or overseers, was distinctly English, and similar committees, "feoffees," were proposed by both Dedham and Ipswich, before Dorchester.² The wardens may be considered a type of school committee, though not apparently the source of the town school committees developed later. While the town delegated certain powers to this body, it took care to reserve to itself the final power in appointing new wardens, requiring an accounting of their management, approving the schoolmaster chosen, and levying a tax through the selectmen for repair of the schoolhouse. The wardens did not exercise power in the later history of the school to the extent one would expect.

The Dorchester school appears to have been in operation by October 31, 1639, Thomas Waterhouse³ being the first master, and, apparently, continuously throughout the period to 1647. It appears then that Dorchester gave less public support for education

¹ See *Hist. of Dorchester*, pp. 161-64, for the documents on this point. A petition of October 8, 1659, asserts that the loss of the island resulted in "the almost if not total overthrow of or free scoole w^{ch} was soe hopefull for posterity, both our owne and neighbors also who had or might have reaped benefit thereby." (*Op. cit.*, p. 433).

² See below on this point.

³ Mr. Waterhouse was, apparently, teaching October 31, 1639, for a vote on that date relieved him from teaching writing "only to doe what he can conueniently therein" ("Fourth Rept. Rec. Com.," *op. cit.*, p. 40). He returned to England about 1642 (*Hist. of Dorchester*, pp. 479-81).

between 1642 and 1647 than Boston, and showed less inclination to raise money by taxation than either Boston or Charlestown.

Salem thus records a vote at a general town meeting in February, 1639/40: "Young Mr. Norris Chose by this Assemblie to teach skoole."¹ At the Quarterly Court, March 30, 1641, "Col. Endecot brought up the matter of a free skoole and therefore wished a whole town meeting about it;" whereupon it was decided "that goodman Auger Warne a towne meeting the second day of the week."² The next vote of the town occurred September 30, 1644, as follows: "Ordered that a vote be published one [*Sic*] the next Lecture day that such as have Children to be kept at schoole would bring in their names and what they will give for one whole year & Also That if any poore body hath children or a childe to be put to Schoole & not able to pay for their schooling That the Town will pay it by a rate."³ These items show that the town of Salem was depending on voluntary contributions, in the main, for the support of the school. The principle of taxation by rate was adopted only for the education of the children of those parents unable to contribute. This policy of school support, viz., distributing the burden partly on parents of pupils sending children and partly on the whole body of inhabitants paying taxes, was often adopted by other New England towns in the seventeenth century. It may be noted that this is the first mention of the word "rate" in a town record of Massachusetts, though we have no evidence that it was actually laid at this time for the purpose stated.⁴

¹ "Salem Town Rec. 1634-59," in *Essex Inst. Hist. Collec.*, IX, 97 ff. He evidently commenced teaching soon after for Lechford speaks of him as Schoolmaster at Salem. (See *Plaine Dealing*, p. 84.)

² *Hist. of Salem*, I, 427-28, as quoted by Felt. The order varies as printed—" [Goodman Auger is ordered to call a general town meeting the second day of the week to see about a free school—*Waste Book*]" *Rec. and Files of Quar. Courts of Essex Co.*, Vol. I, 1636-56, p. 25.

³ "Salem Town Rec.," *op. cit.*, p. 132. No other vote on the school occurred before 1647.

⁴ The word "rate," used in connection with school support, occurs in the records of six towns before January 21, 1647, viz.: Salem, September 30, 1644; Boston, December, 2, 1644; Dedham, January 1, 1644/5; Dorchester, March 15, 1645; Guilford (in New Haven Colony), October 7, 1646; and Charlestown, January 20, 1646/7. Besides these towns there were two others where payment by rate was evidently

Under the date November, 1642, the Ipswich town records declare: "The town votes that there shall be a free school."¹ On October 3, 1643, the town voted that in view of a former grant respecting the establishment of a free school, "now there should be XIb yannum raised as the Committee in that case yvided, shall determine. And that there shalbe Seven free schollars, or soe many as the Feoffees (to be chosen) from tyme to tyme shall order," but the number was not to be more than seven.² As there is no further vote between 1643 and 1647, and little seems to be known concerning the history of the school at this date, it is uncertain whether the vote of 1643 was carried out.³ It provides for an expenditure of £11, but the amount was not necessarily to be raised by taxation. It shows that a committee, to be appointed by the town, was to raise the money and that feoffees, apparently to be chosen by the town, should be a permanent committee.

On January 2, 1642/3, the town of Dedham voted unanimously to set apart land for public use, "for the Towne, the Church, and A fre Schoole, viz: 40 acres at the least or 60 acres at the most."⁴ On January 1, 1644/5, because of "the great necessitie of providing some meanes for the Education of the youth in or sd Towne," Dedham voted unanimously to raise £20 annually to maintain a schoolmaster to keep a free school. It was also voted that this sum, together with the land already set apart for public use, should

intended when such phrases were used as "common stock" of the town (New Haven, February 25, 1641/2), and "town charge" (Hartford, April, 1643). There was considerable objection to the use of a "rate" even for the support of the church up to 1643. See note in Lechford, *Plaine Dealing*, pp. 50-51; and Hubbard, "Hist. of New Eng.," *op. cit.*, p. 412. "This new way of cessment was offensive to some."

¹ *Ipswich Town Rec.*, Vol. I, 1634-50 (1899), p. 24b. "The First third day of the 9th 1642." In the old record book of the Grammar School is an item dated 1636: "A Grammar School is set up, but does not succeed." Felt says this has the appearance of having been copied (*Hist. of Ipswich, etc.*, p. 83.)

² *Ipswich Town Rec.*, p. 26.

³ Like Salem, the notion of free education applied only to poor children; so also in the vote of Hartford, April, 1643, below. There is no other vote on schools before 1647, and there is doubt whether it existed as a town school, 1644-50. See Hammatt, "Ipswich Grammar School," in *New Eng. Hist. and Gen. Reg.*, VI, 64.

⁴ *Dedham Town Rec.*, Vol. III, 1636-59, p. 92. There are fifty-one names given of those who voted on this matter.

be intrusted to "Feoffees" chosen by the town, who should improve the same for the use of the school; and that as the profits arose from the land "everyman may be proportionably abated" of his proportion of the £ 20, "freely to be given to ye use aforesaid." The "Feoffees" were given power to make a *rate* for the necessary charges in improving the land, accounting for the same to the town. Five men named were chosen feoffees, three of whom were on the board of Selectmen for this year.¹ This plan evidently contemplated support by voluntary contributions, until the income from the land increased sufficiently to support the school without such contribution. The vote lacks the element of a tax, for nothing is said about a levy by distress in case of a failure to pay, as occurred in the case of Dorchester in its first vote of 1639. The phrase "freely to be given" indicates a disposition to avoid giving any power to force a man to support the school, as a tax levied by distress would do. Again the notion evidently was to provide eventually for an endowed school. Dedham thus established a public town school, free in theory at least, supported in part by contributions, voluntarily granted in town meeting and apparently by the most of the property-owners, and in part from income to be derived from town land. As in the case of Dorchester, however, it lacks all the elements of a real tax, since the contribution in question cannot be considered compulsory. Nevertheless, the right to tax every property-holder for the improvement of the school land is provided for, and thus there might be partial support by general taxation, somewhat like the case of Dorchester, and preceding the latter by more than three months. But we have no evidence that such a tax was laid. Dedham also, it may be noted, like Boston, granted town land, for the endowment of the school.²

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 105. In a division of land February 4, 1644/5, eighty-three men received portions (*ibid.*, pp. 109-10). On this same date the town voted to grant the remainder of the "Training ground to the Feoffees" to be improved by them to October 31, 1650. By the same vote five men, named, were chosen feoffees. Two of them, with one of the selectmen, were appointed to set off the land in question, March 4, 1644/5 (*ibid.*, p. 108).

² There is no other vote before 1647, and the records of the feoffees are not extant. Proof of the opening of the school before 1647 is wanting. See *Dedham Hist. Reg.*, I, 88.

The schools at Cambridge and Newbury were apparently private. The former was not aided by the town before 1647,¹ and the latter was aided only once within this period and then for a single year.² The school at Roxbury was not a town school, and was neither established, managed, nor supported by a vote in town meeting before 1647.³

Under date of February 25, 1641/2, at a General Court held at New Haven, it was ordered that a free school should be set up in the town, and the pastor Mr. Davenport, with the magistrates, should consider "Whatt yearly allowance is meete to be given to itt out of the comō stock of the towne, and also whatt rules and orders are meet to be observed in and about the same."⁴ Owing to a doubt as to the accuracy of the records kept by Secretary Fugill, the General Court ordered a revision of the colony and town records, February 24, 1644/5. In the minutes given under this order the following appears:

"For the better trayning upp of youth in this towne, that through God's Blessinge they may be fitted for publique service hereafter, either in church or

¹ There is but one item relating to education on the town records of Cambridge before 1647. On May 11, 1638, the town voted that two and two-thirds acres be set aside "to the Professor is to the Town's use for evr. for a publick scoole or Colledge to the use of Mr. Nath. Eaton as long as he shall be Employed in that work," etc. Mr. Nathaniel Eaton, who was granted about two acres by the same vote, was the first teacher at Harvard College (1638-40). This is evidently aid to higher education. Elijah Corlett, master of the Grammar School at this time, or a little later, was not aided by the town until November 13, 1648 (*ibid.*, p. 77). Cambridge, therefore, cannot be properly included in the list of towns that established or aided a town school before 1647. For Eaton, see Hubbard, *Gen. Hist. New Eng.*, Mass. Hist. Soc. Collec., 2d Ser., V, 247. Hubbard was a graduate of Harvard, class of 1642.

² In 1639 the town of Newbury granted ten acres of land to Anthony Somerby for his "Encouragement" to keep school for one year. As no other vote occurs on this subject before 1647, it was probably conducted as a private school if in operation after this date. Mr. Somerby was town clerk of Newbury for more than thirty years. (Currier, *Hist. of Newbury*, p. 395.)

³ The school at Roxbury was established in 1645 by voluntary gifts of persons interested. The agreement was signed by sixty-four persons, who bound themselves, their heirs, and assignees to pay annually a sum amounting to £21 10s 8d for the support of a "free School." Those not signing the document were to have no "further benefit [of the school] thereby than other strangers shall have who are no inhabitants." The town refused to contribute to its support up to 1666. (Dillaway, *Hist. of Grammar Sch. of Roxbury*, pp. 7-13, 20, 39, 33; and Winthrop, *Journal*, *loc. cit.*)

⁴ Hoadly, *Rec. of Col. and Planta. of New Haven, 1638-1649*, p. 62.

comonweale, it is ordered, that a free schoole be sett upp, & the magistrates with the teaching elders are intreated to consider what rules and orders are meete to be observed & what allowance may be convenient for the schoolmars care & paynes, wch shalbe paid out of the towns stocke. According to wch order, 20 £ a yeare was paid to Mr. Ezekiell Cheevers, the present schoolema^r for 2 or 3 yeares at first, but that not proveing a competent maintenance, in August, 1644, it was enlarged to 30 £ a yeare & soe contineweth."¹

It seems evident that the vote of February 25, 1641/2, had been put into effect soon after its passage, and that Mr. Cheevers must have received an allowance of £20 out of the "Common Stock" of the town as early as the spring or summer of 1642—the phrase "two or three years" not allowing us to set an exact date.

Guilford, in New Haven Colony, was founded in 1639, and a school supported by contributions appears to have been established in 1643.² The first town vote on the subject, October 7, 1646, provided for a committee of three to collect contributions for the salaries of Mr. Whitfield (pastor) and Mr. Higginson.³ The record continues: "It is ordered that whoever shall put any child to schoole to Mr. Higginson shall not pay for lesse than a quarter's time at once and so shall be reckoned with all quarterly, though they have neglected to send all the time, at the rate of four shillings by the quarter to the Treasurer. It is agreed and ordered that ye additional sum toward Mr. Higginson's maintenance, with respect to the schoole, shall be paid by the Treasurer, yearly, out of the best of the rates in due season, according to our agreements." This vote shows that the support fell partly on the parents sending children to the school and partly "out of the best of the rates in due season." The meaning of this phrase is not clear, but it seems to indicate that an additional sum to make up a salary agreed upon was raised by rate. This is the fifth New England town to use the word "rate" in connection with the support of a town school before 1647.⁴

¹ Hoadly, *op. cit.*, p. 120. At a court held February 8, 1643/4, Mr. Cheevers "desired 4-3-6 out of the estate of Mr. Trobridge, which is justly due to him for teaching ye children" (*ibid.*, p. 124). This also seems to indicate support by rate.

² Mr. Higginson was teacher of the church, meaning a sort of assistant pastor, and apparently had charge of the school from 1643 to 1646, supported, like the pastor, by voluntary contributions. (Steiner, *Hist. of Guilford*, pp. 27, 35, 40, 60.)

³ Steiner, *op. cit.*, p. 394; Smith, *Hist. of Guilford*, p. 80.

⁴ See n. 4, p. 372.

On December 6, 1642, the town of Hartford voted as follows: "It is agreed that thurte pownd a yeer shall be seatled upon the School by the towne for efer."¹ But in April, 1643, this plan was greatly modified, by ordering Mr. Andrews, the teacher, to teach one year from March 25, 1643, for £16, to be paid by the parents sending their children in proportion to the time sent, at the rate of 20 shillings a year. But those unable to pay should give "notes" to the selectmen, who would pay the teacher at the town's charge. Mr. Andrews was to keep the record and sent "Nottes" and demand payment. If then his wages did not amount to the sum specified, the selectmen were to collect and pay what was lacking "at the Townes Charges."² The first vote evidently provided for a free school established and supported by the town. The second provided for most of the income by tuition fees, and the rest by taxation, first for the education of poor children, (thus preceding Salem by seventeen months) and secondly, to make up a contingent remainder which might arise from a small number of pupils who were obliged to pay for their education. If we assume that Mr. Cheevers, at New Haven, did not receive his allowance from the town until after December 6, 1642, then Hartford would have the honor of establishing the first public free school supported by a general tax, provided we admit that the £30 was to be raised in this way. It is not so stated, however, and, moreover, it is very unlikely that New Haven did not grant money out of the "common stock" before the date in question. Although the word "rate" or "tax" is not used in the New Haven records, there is hardly any other way to account for the payments to Mr. Cheevers than by means of a tax.

According to a statement of John Callender,³ Robert Lenthal,⁴ who had been pastor at Weymouth, Massachusetts, came to

¹ *Hartford Town Votes*, Vol. I, 1635-1716, p. 63, in *Collec. Conn. Hist. Soc.*, Vol. VI (1897).

² *Ibid.*, p. 65.

³ *An Historical Discourse, etc.*, (Ed. by Elton, 1843), p. 110. This was first published in 1739 and is the only evidence we have for this vote which does not occur in the printed records surviving. (Arnold, *Hist. of R.I.*, I, 145; *Collec. R. I. Hist. Soc.*, IV, 116; *R.I. Colo. Rec.*, I, 104.)

⁴ Mr. Lenthal returned to England before March 17, 1642 (*ibid.*, p. 119). See also, Savage, *Genealogical Dictionary, etc.*, III, 78; and Lechford, *Plaine Dealing*, pp. 57-58, 94.

Newport, Rhode Island, and was admitted a freeman August 6, 1640. On August 20, he was

"by vote called to keep a public school for the learning of youth, and for his encouragement there was granted to him and his heirs one hundred acres of land, and four more for an house lot, it was also voted that one hundred acres should be laid forth, and appropriated for a school, for encouragement of the poorer sort, to train up their youth in learning, and Mr. Robert Lenthal, while he continues to teach school, is to have the benefit thereof.¹

Nothing further is known concerning this school.

To award the honors to each town is not easy, but the following observations seem warranted from the evidence submitted. Boston was the first town to choose a schoolmaster in town meeting (April 13, 1635). Charlestown was the first to vote to establish a town school (June 3, 1636), appoint a schoolmaster with salary and length of service fixed, set a date for opening the school (August 8, 1636), and appoint a school committee (February 12, 1637/8). It is the first to give good evidence that it had a town school in continuous operation for a considerable period (August 8, 1636, to February 12, 1637/8). There is no evidence to show whether the £ 40 voted in 1636 was raised by general taxation, yet the votes show that the town made itself responsible for payment, and the next year appointed a committee in town meeting to settle the wages of the master for past and future work. This seems to be reasonably good proof that Charlestown should have the honor of establishing the first town school, because all the steps involving the establishment, management, and support were taken in town meeting. Dorchester was the first to provide for a permanent town school, with the annual income fixed and the method of raising it determined (May 20, 1639), though the payments made by individuals fell only on persons holding certain property. Nevertheless since these payments could be collected by distress it is fair to call it a tax-supported school, though the tax was not raised by a rate or general levy on all property-holders. Salem was the first town in Massachusetts (but see Newport and Hartford) to vote to support a town school in part by a rate on all property-holders (September 30, 1644), though such support was for poor children.

¹ Callender, *op. cit.*

Dedham was the first to vote to raise a definite sum annually (January 1, 1644/5), "freely to be given," presumably by "everyman" (*everyman* may be proportionally abated," etc.). This is support by voluntary contribution. It is impossible to say what the town would have done in case a contributor later refused to contribute. Without another vote it seems that compulsion could not have been used. There is no evidence that such a vote was taken or even that it was necessary. This school, therefore, cannot be considered a tax-supported school, as this word is ordinarily used. Dedham was also the first town to *elect* a permanent committee to manage school property, "feoffees," (February 4, 1644/5), though Ipswich was the first to *propose* such a committee (October 3, 1643). Newbury was the first to grant public or town land to a schoolmaster, expressly for his "encouragement" to keep school (1639). Newport was the first to set apart a large tract of town land as a permanent endowment for a school (August 6, 1640), though the income was, by the vote, to be used for the "poorer sort." New Haven was the first which gives satisfactory evidence that it supported a town school out of "town stock," meaning, presumably, money raised by a general tax levied on all property-holders (1642). This view, however, rejects the vote of Charlestown as inconclusive on the method of raising the £40 voted in 1636. Hartford was the first to vote an annual sum, for the support of the school, "by the towne for efer" (December 6, 1642); the intent being, apparently, to raise the money by taxation. It was also the first to vote to provide for the education of poor children "at the Townes Charges;" viz., evidently by taxation (April, 1643).

We may conclude then that certain towns in New England had, before 1647, voluntarily established, managed, and supported town schools, and developed the following important principles: First, towns in their corporate capacity took the initiative in establishing town or public schools, and in aiding those already established. Secondly, they assumed responsibility for the support of schools out of public property, partly through gifts of land to schoolmasters, partly by setting aside tracts of land as a permanent endowment. Thirdly, they voted to levy a rate or tax on property-holders for the partial support of the school. This method was

proposed, and the word "rate" used, by at least six of the eleven towns mentioned before January 21, 1647, and taxation is implied in two others. Thus the foundation for the famous act of 1647 had been well laid by voluntary effort of the towns in question. Nevertheless the action of a few of the larger towns must not blind us to the fact that this accounts for less than one-fifth of all the towns that had been established in New England at this date. Even allowing for the fact that a few more would probably be added if the records were complete, yet they could accommodate but a very small proportion of the pupils of school age. New England had a population of at least 25,000 by 1647,¹ and at that time we do not have evidence of more than eleven *town* schools in operation. If other towns had schools they were private rather than public. In most cases, no doubt, the people were depending on parental education. Indeed, the Massachusetts act of 1642 does not mention schools, but complains that there was "great neglect in many parents and masters in training up their children in learning and labor . . . especially of their ability to read and understand the principles of religion and the capital laws of the country."² Thus at this date the school was not considered by the General Court, or even by most of the towns, as a matter of public concern, to be supported by the town, as was the church, for example. The school as an organized public agency for carrying on education was fighting for recognition, and great efforts would have to be made before the principles established voluntarily by a few towns would become general. The General Court of Massachusetts recognized this in 1647, and took the next important step in public education by compelling towns with a certain number of families to establish certain types of town schools. But the discussion of this famous act and its results is reserved for later treatment.

¹ This is estimated from the data given by Dexter, "Estimates of Population in the American Colonies," *Proc. Am. Ant. Soc.*, U.S., V, 22-32.

² *Rec. Co. Mass. Bay*, II, 6, June 14, 1642.

BRITISH AND AMERICAN PRONUNCIATION: RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

LOUISE POUND
University of Nebraska

I

Spoken language today has, as it deserves, nearly as much attention as written. It is subjected to rigid scrutiny and recorded, so far as possible, with the scientist's minuteness and precision. The learner may now find differences between Southern English and Northern, or between these and the English of Scotland, set forth with exactness by phonetic specialists. Among laymen, interest in fastidious pronunciation was never stronger; nor, it might be added, conviction with reference to what is or is not "standard" more positive; for, of course, it is the amateur in phonetic matters who speaks with strongest conviction and feels surest of his message. Because of this strong wave of contemporary interest in the oral tongue, and of the fact that we English-speaking Americans are now in the first quarter of the fourth century since our origin from the parent-stock, the present seems an appropriate time to pause for certain questions. Just what is the present status of American in comparison with British English? How far have we gone in the way of variation? If the oral languages of these countries are still pretty close together, may they be expected to keep together?

II

Not yet forgotten by our compatriots nor by the British is the characterization of American speech made by Mr. Henry James when on a visit to the United States in 1905. In an address delivered in that year to the graduating class of Bryn Mawr College, entitled "The Question of Our Speech," he arraigns us—sympathetically and discriminatingly, it is true, yet with ill-concealed horror—for the "slovenly" character of our national speech, and he commiserates us on the way in which our talk has

been allowed to run wild, as it were, without any sort of careful supervision. Mr. James's standard of beauty and integrity for our language is apparently the Southern English of the educated classes—the instructed of London, or of Oxford and Cambridge. There has been, he thinks, regrettable neglect:

. . . no civilized body of men and women has ever left so vital an interest to run wild, to shift, as we say, all for itself, to stumble and flounder through mere adventure and accident, in the common dust of life, to pick up a living, in fine, by the wayside and the ditch.

He mentions our tendency to speak without consideration for . . . the innumerable differentiated, discriminated units of sound and sense that lend themselves to audible production, to enunciation, to intonation, those innumerable units that have each an identity, a quality, an outline, a shape, a clearness, a fineness, a sweetness, a richness, that have, in a word, a value, which it is open to us, as lovers of our admirable English tradition, or as cynical traitors to it, to preserve or to destroy.

He regards the unsettled character and the inferior quality of the colloquial *vox Americana* as in part a product of that mere state of indifference to a speech standard and a tone standard peculiar to our compatriots. British English, French, Italian, do not, he feels, strike the world as abandoned to their fate. Yet he is able to speak sympathetically of conditions here and to supply the explanation of our shortcomings:

Yet I cannot wholly forget that the adventure, as I name it, of our idiom and the adventure of our utterance have been fundamentally the same adventure and the same experience; that they at a given period migrated together, immigrated together, into the great raw world in which they were to be cold-shouldered and neglected together, left to run wild and to lose their way altogether.

. . . whereas the great idioms of Europe in general have grown up at home and in the family, the ancestral circle, our transported maiden, our unrescued Andromeda, our medium of utterance, was to be disjoined from all associations, the other presences that had attended her, that had watched for her, that had helped to form her manners and her voice, her taste and genius. . . . To the American common school, to the American newspaper, and to the American Dutchman and Dago, as the voice of the people describes them, we have simply handed over our property—not exactly bound hand and foot, I admit, like Andromeda awaiting her Perseus, but at least distracted, dishevelled, despoiled, divested of that beautiful and becoming drapery of native atmosphere and circumstance which had, from far back, made, on its behalf, for practical protection, for a due tenderness of interest.

The position outlined in these quotations is, we well know, the position taken by many people of education and of cosmopolitan experience. They are convinced that American English has become a raw and slovenly speech when considered in relation to parent-English, and they vaguely feel that there should be a more distinct memory of the latter, even if it be but as a beautiful tradition which may be destroyed. As early as 1828, Noah Webster issued a preliminary announcement of emancipation, when he entitled his classic work *An American Dictionary of the English Language*, and allowed or recommended American rules for pronunciation where his more conservative rival, the lexicographer Worcester, did not. That was nearly a hundred years ago. And indeed since the day of Richard Grant White—thought by many rather an arbiter of elegances in his day—there has been no conspicuous champion of absolute conformity to the British standard. Nevertheless there are among us many educators who direct their pupils to the entries in British dictionaries of English as a higher or more final guide than our own, in matters of pronunciation as well as of definition. Sometimes this is done with accompanying disparagement of "Americanism"; and sometimes, too, it is done at the pupil's risk, as will be seen later. Mr. James was addressing himself against indiscriminating articulation in general, as well as against departure from Old World usage. But it is clear that he feels that Old World spoken English is beautiful and that New World English is not; and he is not alone in the feeling that American English is corrupt. "The reason why the people of the United States pronounce English so shockingly," says a recent writer in the *Educational Review*, "is that they hear it shockingly spoken at home and at school." In short, according to the belief of many, American English is in a very bad way, and this fact might as well be squarely faced.

With Mr. James we have an instance of an Anglicized American characterizing our speech to an audience of Americans and pointing out our degeneracy, sympathetically, it is true, but with finality. It is of interest to turn, in contrast, to the words of an Englishman, addressing British readers. The poet laureate, Mr. Robert Bridges, opens his recent and much-discussed tract *On the Present State of English Pronunciation* by asking: "Is English pronunciation at the

present time on the road to ruin? and if so, can anything be done to save it?" Mr. Bridges is stimulated to his protest by the transcriptions of present-day standard British English made by the professional phonetician and secretary of the International Phonetic Association, Mr. Daniel Jones, of University College, London. These transcriptions horrified him into the certainty that "phonetic decay" threatens the language.

The only question can be whether Mr. Jones exaggerates the actual prevalence of degradation. Some will acquit him of any exaggeration. Others I know very well will regard him as a half-witted faddist, beneath serious notice, who should be left to perish in his vain imaginings. Any one who thinks this, and believes that his own speech is above reproach, should at once examine it; if he cannot trust his own ear, let him ask a friend to note what sounds he really utters when he talks. I should say that he may congratulate himself if he does not pronounce more than 70 per cent of his words as Mr. Jones represents them. Most everyday talk is little but *derderderderdy*.

The laureate would have the indorsement of the western American professor who returning from his first trip to London reported his shock at hearing the British speak. "They are simply spoiling the English language over there," he said. Mr. James felt that we are "simply spoiling" the English language in the United States, and termed our national use of vocal sound "an absolutely inexpert daub of unapplied tone," of which, he implied, speakers of European languages are not guilty. Mr. Bridges says of contemporary British speech as he finds it in the transcriptions of a specialist: "Such a pronunciation as Mr. Jones teaches should be repudiated with all the authority that can be martialed against it."

In behalf of the phonetic specialist arraigned it should be pointed out that Mr. Bridges would be less horrified at the transcriptions which prompted his tract if he realized the distinction to be made for the same vowel when it occurs in stressed and in unstressed usage. He writes: "Foreigners are really being taught that the pronunciation of 'to,' which is hundreds of years old, is now changed into 'ter,' and that in our 'careful conversation' we say 'ter' and 'in ter' for 'to' and 'into'" — *er* (*r* silent) being Mr. Bridges' way of writing, for the time being, the slurred vowel heard in the first syllables of "again," "alone." But Mr. Jones also, when treating "to" and "into" as isolated words, would give full quality to their

vowels; while Mr. Bridges, saying these words in word groups, with the emphasis elsewhere, would probably find himself uttering the less distinct vowel. Mr. Jones's entries for "to" and "into" in his *Phonetic Dictionary* show unimpeachable vowel-length and quality, which is demonstration enough that the laureate's statement that foreigners are being taught to say "ter" and "inter" needs qualification. The principle that change in vowel quality is dependent upon degree of emphasis is obvious enough to students of sound; it is mentioned here only for the reason that various discussions and reviews called forth by the laureate's article seem to show no recognition of the part played by this principle, if the transcription is to be accurate, when words are presented not by themselves but in word-groups. In Mr. Bridges' own transcriptions, it is to be noted that he gives the vowels of the last syllables of words like "player," "lawyer," the same quality as the vowel in "bed"; this no doubt is his protest against "vowel degradation." But the vowel in "bed" is not properly the vowel heard in the unstressed final syllables in question. To say "play-yers," "law-yers" with the same full vowel as in "bed" does violence to the genius of the language. It would sound strange and unnatural, indeed, if vowels were always pronounced as when they have the accent. Some part of Mr. Bridges' dismay and of his distrust of Mr. Jones's transcriptions may be traced to his failure to realize the difference between fuller and more reduced vowel sounds as dependent on word-grouping and on stress.

III

From the preceding it is clear that the feeling exists among many that pronunciation is very much a matter of aesthetics, and may in part be consciously controlled. It is also clear that it is usually the older or the established in language which is likely to seem beautiful. Both Mr. James and Mr. Bridges feel that there is an ideal of the aesthetic and the integrate in English speech which must be preserved, if preservation is possible. Conscious supervision helping to maintain this ideal they think imperative. Mr. James, though he nowhere makes a specific plea for conformity to British standards, is really desirous that the speech of the New World make itself more acceptable in Old World ears. Mr. Bridges wishes to save or to

try to save living British speech to older standards. In particular, he would like to inhibit the changes appearing in Southern English and to restore the pronunciation of the North. It is the speech of the upper classes of London, which is also the speech of Oxford and Cambridge, to which the greatest body of educated English people endeavor to conform. Northern English has undergone fewer changes than Southern, and the speech of Scotchmen, yet more conservative than Northern English, preserves in many points the pronunciation of the eighteenth-century southerner. Mr. Bridges does not think it hopeless that certain features persisting in the North, as the sounding of medial and final *r*, may be brought back in the speech of the South, and he is willing to do his best to promote such restoration.

A second thing apparent from the preceding discussions is the recognition, by laymen as well as by professional linguists, that both British and American English are changing. The American speech is diverging from the British, and the British speech is changing within itself. It is the former tendency which has greatest interest to us in the United States. Whether or not both speeches are on the "road to ruin," they may no longer be treated as orally identical.

The historical fact is that American English, an offshoot of seventeenth-century English, the English of the Colonial period, is somewhat more conservative on the whole than is the present-day speech of London, accepted by speakers of the Old World as "standard English." Like Northern English it preserves some points of eighteenth-century pronunciation, e.g., the pronunciation of final *r*, which its parent has given up. It might be pointed out to sympathizers with Mr. James that in some respects the "abandoned child" is that offspring of the mother tongue which is most tenacious of its inheritance. Let us, however, now look at some of the most salient differences which by this time have developed between British English and English in the United States.

IV

Divergences between the American and the British vowel schemes already exist. The difference in quality, under certain conditions, for the vowel *a* affects large groups of words. British

a generally has the sound of *a* in "father" in words like "calf," "staff," "path," "clasp," "past," "ask," "class," i.e., before *f*, *th*, *sp*, *st*, *sk*, *ss*, and *n* followed by certain consonants. In some sections of the United States, namely, in New England and the South, *a* has this sound; but it is not so pronounced universally, nor does the conventional dictionary entry for these words give them their British or New England values. It is now pretty customary over the United States to recommend for these words an "intermediate" or compromise vowel, half-way between that of "father" and that of "cab." But this compromise vowel is somewhat academic, or artificial. The popular usage of the country as a whole, that of the greatest area and of the majority of people has, beyond question the vowel of "cab." The divergence in pronunciation for this particular vowel is of real importance; it involves, not a few scattered words, but large groups of terms in everyday use, and in the long run it may become a marked characteristic.¹

Difference is to be noted also for short *o*, which in the United States is splitting up into several sounds in a manner puzzling to the makers of "rules." British short *o* as in "hot" is still made with slight lip-rounding, is a real *o* sound, nearly like the *o* in German *ob*. In the United States the vowel has mainly lost its lip-rounding and become like the *a* of German *Mann*, the short vowel corresponding to the long vowel of "father." This is the vowel usually heard in "crop," "top," "not," "hot," or in "fog," "bog," "pod," and the like, in the Middle West, and it is heard, here spelled with *a*, in "was" ("woz"). This development has not been recognized in the dictionaries, yet the tendency has prevailed over the greater part of the country and was long ago noted by linguists. Where the vowel has not taken this direction it has lengthened and lowered into the sound of *o* in American "long" (short in England) or "storm," a vowel often appearing in British "lore," "more," sometimes exact homophones of British "law," "maw." A group of

¹ In an article in the *Nation*, January 17, 1915, the suggestion comes from Boston that in our ordinary urban speech *ah* is losing ground of late, while, on the other hand, the scholastic or educational tendency toward *ah*, over the land as a whole, is perhaps gaining converts. What the outcome will be, vogue, which has long fluctuated between the sounds of *a* in question, will alone decide.

Contrary to general belief, *ah*, in the types of words involved, is really the newer, not the older sound.

words like "dog," "fog," "hog," "cob," "coffee," "orange," "God," will show either the unrounded vowel first noted or that appearing in "lord," "law." Not very commonly among ordinary speakers will these words have the British rounded short *o*, which is the original vowel.

There are a few other differences involving vowels, as the use of shortened vowels in the United States where length remains in the parent language. So British "been," rhyming with "seen," American "bin," British "again," rhyming with "rain," American "agen." The suffix *-ile* of words like "agile," "docile," "juvenile," "hostile," pronounced in England with the *-ile* of "wile," "mile," is consistently shortened in America. Some individual words showing variation are "betrothed," British *o* as in "loath," American *o* as in "cloth," "leisure," often in England a rhyme for "measure," "squirrel," having in England the *i* of "virulent," not that of "sir," British "e-poch," "e-volution, and the familiar "clark," "darby" as over against the "clerk," "derby" of the United States. Loss of unaccented medial vowels is commoner in England than in this country; witness pronunciations like "intrist," "ordinry," "diffrens," "seprit" (the adjective) "subordnit," "suprintend," "sekritry," "missionry," "regment," "medcine." These may count as standard in England, but are rarely heard with entire omission of the weak vowel in the United States.

The influence on English speech of the so-called "cockney" dialect of London is very strong. Chiefly characteristic of it are its nasalization of vowels and its tendency to modify the vowel sounds heard in words like "make," "note," "house." Mr. Bridges complains of a professor in Germany who, he is told, is "now actively teaching his pupils to pronounce English in the extreme cockney dialect because he is convinced that that is the pronunciation of the near future."

Differences are to be noted for consonants as well as for vowels. Divergence affecting, like the shiftings of *a* and *o*, large and important tracts of speech and destined in the long run to bring greater differences than now realized, appears in usage as regards the consonant *r*. In Southern or standard English, *r* has practically disappeared when final, or when followed by a consonant; though it

remains in these positions in Scotland. In the pronunciation of the younger generation of standard speakers, British "more" and "maw," "lord" and "laud," "door" and "daw," "soar" or "sore" and "saw," "pour" or "pore" and "paw" are exact homophones. When they are not homophones—this is the usage of the older generation of speakers—the place of *r* is taken by a vowel glide. And this loss of *r*, then of the vowel glide replacing it, in many cases brings alteration of the preceding vowel. To continue illustration, among the newer generation of speakers, "your" and "yaw," "sure" and "shaw," are identical, and "pouring" is indistinguishable from "pawing." In the usage of few poets, it is true, would words like "morn," and "dawn," "alms" and "arms" yet be recognized as perfect rhymes; for literary usage is traditional and conservative; but instances of such rhyming grow more frequent and sooner or later these rhymes, already perfect to the ear in London English, will be legitimate to the eye, for the literary English of the Old World. Mr. Bridges himself is said somewhere to have rhymed "vase" and "Mars."

What now of the consonant *r* in the United States?

In eastern New England usage is about that of the older generation in southern England. Elsewhere *r* is spoken as strongly or more strongly than Scotch *r*. The testimony of Professor C. H. Grandgent of Cambridge may be cited as well indicating, in brief compass, the status of *r* in the United States:

Both in most of Connecticut and Vermont, and in Massachusetts west of the Connecticut River, *r*, with the majority of speakers, always has its consonantal value, although of course it is never trilled. This is the practice of the rest of the North and West, while the South agrees with eastern New England. The *r* country seems to be increasing rather than diminishing, and even in the *r*-less region, especially in the cities, consonant *r* is probably gaining ground, partly through school training and partly through Irish influence.¹

If the loss of *r* becomes universalized in England and its retention becomes universalized in America,² the resultant national deviation will have unescapable significance. It involves groups of words that are part of the very fiber of the language. The divergence

¹ From Franklin to Lowell, *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, III, 230.

² Here also it is vogue alone which will ultimately decide.

seems negligible to many at the present time mainly because there is as yet no difference to the eye.

Usage in the United States with reference to this consonant was one of the features of our speech which especially disconcerted Mr. James. He comments with mingled indulgence and annoyance on our superfluous retention of the very consonant which Mr. Bridges would like to see restored in the speech of London:

. . . . the letter, I grant, gets terribly little rest among those great masses of our population who strike us, in the boundless West perhaps especially, as, under some strange impulse received toward consonantal recovery of balance, making it present even in words from which it is absent, bringing it in everywhere as with the small vulgar effect of a sort of morose grinding of the back teeth. There are, you see, sounds of a mysterious intrinsic meanness, and there are sounds of a mysterious intrinsic frankness and sweetness; and I think the recurrent note I have indicated—"fatherr," and "motherr" and "otherr," "waterr," and "matterr" and "scatterr," "harrrd" and "barrrd," "parrrt," "starrt" and (dreadful to say) "arrt" (the repetition it is that drives home the ugliness)—are signal specimens of what becomes of a custom of utterance out of which the principle of taste has been dropped.

That the "principle of taste" in pronunciation is largely a relative thing should be clear. There are many varieties of *r*-sounds, some of which are perhaps more attractive than others to the average ear; yet one feels that if Mr. James heard our American *r* sounded in some foreign tongue or used by a Scotchman, he would not find it disagreeable. It is the loss of *r* in Britain and in New England which makes its presence ugly to him in words where these regions have not retained it. There are people who find something "intrinsically unbeautiful" in the vowel of "cab," especially when it appears in words of the type of "ask" or "path." When hearing the same vowel, or one nearly like it, in "where," "fair," "wear," etc., these same people are untroubled.

A second important divergence appearing in consonants affects the initial sound of words like "which," "what," "when," "while." In the United States these keep their initial breath sound; they might well be written "hwen," "hwat," "hwich," "hwile." In London English *w* is substituted, "wat," "wich," "wen," "wile." This usage was originally a provincialism but is now standard. Initial *hw* is still heard, however, and it is not impossible, some

Britons think, that *h* may sometime be restored. In the United States the *h*-less forms are rare and seem in no danger of increasing.

Commoner in England than in the United States is the tendency of certain *tu*-, *du*- words to pass into a modified state (*tch*, *j*) if one may judge from the frequency of cautions against such pronunciations as "Choosday," "chune," "opporchunity," "jooty," "juke" ("duty," "duke"), and the like. It is too early to say whether this tendency will play any very great part as time passes. Already established, however, are such pronunciations as British "bensh," "flinsh," "frinzh," where American English yet demands the dental stop following the nasal, "bentch," "flintch," "frindge." A few individual words showing differences in consonantal values in England and the United States are "lieutenant," British "leftenant"; "schedule," British "shedule"; "nephew," which may be British "nevew," and "suggest," in England lacking the first *g*.

Still other embryo national differences are bound up with the matter of accent. A noticeable difference in pronunciation has developed from the secondary accent arising in the United States in words like "difficult," "secondary," "necessary," "interesting," and the like—polysyllables with initial accent and secondary penultimate or final accent. In England these words have developed no such secondary accent and their pronunciation is reduced: "diffict," "extrordinry," "suprintend," "intresting," etc.

This survey of divergences has not taken into account slight deviations in the manner of articulating sounds, like certain vowels which are less diphthongal in this country than in England, nor the duration of sounds or the tempo of utterance, nor differences in intonation. The object has been but to note salient differences and tendencies.

V

If for several centuries there has been substantial agreement in the pronunciation of the mother- and the daughter-tongue, it is apparent that this agreement can hardly be counted upon to prove eternal. Differences in local or regional influences and in the character of the national life have brought deviations which are no longer negligible, and they probably stand no great chance of being leveled out by time. The differences developed up to this time make no very formidable array, it is true; but the tendency to

conform absolutely to British standards, though it still exists, grows weaker and weaker. The difficulty of keeping the oral languages together will increase, not lessen. A better guide to what is actually taking place than scholarly pronouncement, or scrutiny of the dictionaries, is the feeling, or rather the usage of the masses; for in the long run it is the masses who usually get their way in matters of speech. To the assumption of those who find at the present time very little departure from British standards, and who hold to the belief that cleavage may be held in check, may be opposed the fact that we have drifted so far apart that in each country the accent of the other serves for a comedy part on the stage. In each country the pronunciation of the other is a device to be counted on to provide entertainment for the average audience.

For the written language, unless radical spelling-changes be introduced in one speech and not in the other, duality of standard does not seem imminent. Differences already exist in vocabulary and idiom, but they have to do with outlying words, not the fundamental speech. On the other hand, changes in the spoken language, as in the quality of the vowels *a* and *o* and the loss of *r*, affect words of everyday usage, the very staple of the language. And it is the spoken word, not the written or printed word, which is the real word. What happens to the oral has always in the long run affected the written. If we look far ahead, very far ahead, are we not to expect ultimate divergence to the point of unintelligibility? Three centuries of development make only a beginning. The conception is pretty large, and to linger on it may seem premature if not far-fetched; but it is possible enough that a development like that of popular Latin into the Romance dialects—differing even now to the ear more than they do to the eye—may be paralleled in the course of time by the development of parent English into English in the United States, English in Australia, and perhaps also English in India and Africa. Conservative influences are greater now than ever in the past. Schools, dictionaries, grammars, travel, intercommunication of all kinds—such influences retard changes and level out regional variations. But they can only retard, not stop them. Deviation seems inevitable as we face the centuries stretching ahead. Sounds are by their nature impermanent and variable, and standards of pronunciation relative. Parent English literature

is already beginning to have its daughter literatures, as English literature in the United States, in Canada, in Australia; and in the same way the parent language will sometime have its daughter dialects.

We may, as Mr. James reminded us, be either "lovers of our admirable English tradition or cynical traitors to it to preserve or to destroy." Yet that tradition is no fixed thing; we could not make it absolute if we would. It is true and proper that the best usage should be kept in mind, and that sounds should be "considerately treated." But in pronunciation as in politics the radical position of one generation is likely to be orthodox in the next. There has never been stability in English pronunciation nor a fixed standard of beauty for it, and there never will be. Had the two distinguished writers quoted from so often in these pages held this fact in mind, though they might still feel their aesthetic sensibilities offended, they would accept the inevitable in a more philosophic spirit.

Nevertheless, it is well that the day of separation of American from British English, if it is to come, is yet far off. The sympathies of even the impassive spectator of linguistic history must be on the conservative side. The longer the day of division can be retarded the better. The burden on the educated world in the number of languages to be learned is great enough already. Let us hold the English speech intact as long as we may. Indeed, here lies a real argument against the introduction of reformed spelling; for the latter might hasten the day of cleavage. If one nation and not the other simplified its spelling, or if different systems for reform were adopted by the two, or if both speeches were spelled phonetically, what severance already exists would be emphasized. They would differ to the eye as they do already to the ear. The process once started might be more rapid if the anchor of fixing spelling were torn loose. Whether, if the two countries co-operated, the introduction of simplified spelling might not bring more gain than loss is a separate question. We cannot contemplate the spectacle of the ultimate parting of American from British English, in either sound or form, with much enthusiasm; and we can do the best that in us lies not to hasten the process. The gain of keeping the languages together is too great to be yielded sooner than is inevitable.

THE TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF
ACADEMIES AND HIGH SCHOOLS IN RELATIONS
WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Twenty-seventh Educational Conference of Academies and High Schools in Relations with the University of Chicago was held April 16, 1915. The central theme was "The Relation of the Organized Library to the School." The library topic was chosen because of its peculiar timeliness, since the American Library Association, the library section of the National Education Association, the National Council of the Teachers of English, and other school and library associations in various parts of the country have undertaken a campaign to improve school-library conditions, especially in high schools. The benefits derived from bringing together so many librarians and school men for consideration of a problem of such importance to both sides cannot be overestimated. The Conference was subdivided into fifteen sections organized respectively around subjects of mutual interest to colleges and to secondary schools. Each of these fifteen sections was in charge of a committee of three, consisting of a high-school representative, a librarian, and a representative of the University of Chicago.

Early in January, the forty-five members of committees met at the University of Chicago to consider the general plan for the April meeting submitted by the Program Committee consisting of Principal Spencer R. Smith of the Wendell Phillips High School, Chicago, chairman; Miss Irene Warren, librarian of the School of Education; and Nathaniel Butler of the University. The program was arranged about the high-school curriculum. Hitherto in most of the schools few departments other than those of history, English, and vocational education have considered the relation to the library of much importance. When advance copies of the printed program were distributed some weeks before the Conference many requests came promptly from libraries and schools in various parts of the United States and Canada asking for copies for distribution among their respective boards, because they felt the program itself was

convincing as to the value of the library to all parts of the school. The committees in charge of the various sections found that in many cases exhibits could be made to great advantage.

Following the sessions of the departmental sections, and in accordance with the custom of recent years, a conference of school and University administrative officers was held in the evening, at which two topics of current interest were discussed: (1) "The Granting of College Credit at the University of Chicago for Studies Completed in the High Schools in Excess of the Fifteen Units Required for Entrance to College"; (2) "Excess Credit for College Entrance for High-School Work Done at a High Level of Excellence." The former topic was presented by Dean Angell of the University of Chicago and Principal Sims of the High School at South Bend, Indiana. The second topic was presented by Principals Johnson of the University High School, Giles of DeKalb, Illinois, and Newlon of Decatur, Illinois.

It is not yet determined in what form a more detailed report of these sessions will be published. Appended here is the paper presented at the General Session by Mr. Arthur E. Bostwick, librarian, the St. Louis Public Library, St. Louis, Missouri.

SCHOOL LIBRARIES AND MENTAL TRAINING

ARTHUR E. BOSTWICK

Librarian, St. Louis Public Library

Is it more important in education to impart definite items of information or to train the mind so that it will know how to acquire and wish to acquire? To ask the question is to answer it; yet we do not always live up to our lights.

In the older methods the teacher, or rather his predecessors, decided what it would be necessary for the child to memorize, and then he was made to memorize, while still without appreciation of the need of so doing. We are perhaps in danger today of going to the other extreme. We require so little memorization by the student that the memory, as a practical tool of everyday life, is in danger of falling into disuse. It is surely possible for us to exercise

our pupils' memories, to develop them, and to control them, without giving them the fatal idea that memory is a substitute for thought, or that the assimilation of others' ideas, perfect though it may be, will altogether take the place of the development of one's own. There are still things that one must learn by heart, but since they must be retained below the threshold of consciousness, it is well that if possible they should also be acquired below that threshold. The problem of consciously learning a quantity of items of any kind and then relegating them to one's subconsciousness in such a way that they will be available at any given time is not, of course, impossible. Most of us have at our disposal many facts that we have learned in this way; but I venture to assert that most of us have lost a large proportion of what we thus acquired. Now a man never learns by rote the names of his relations, the positions of the rooms in his house, the names of the streets in his town. He has acquired them subconsciously as he needs them. When the human mind becomes convinced of the need of information of this kind "in its business," the acquiring comes as a matter of course. In a language, the paradigms may be learned unconsciously when the pupil sees that they are necessary in order to understand an interesting passage; the multiplication table and tables of weights and measures require no conscious memorization; or at least such memorization may be undertaken voluntarily as a recognized means to a desired end. I say these things may be done; I am sure that they are in many schools; I am equally sure that they were unheard of in my own boyhood; that is, as recognized methods in teaching. Of course, in spite of schools and teachers and methods, a vast amount of information and training has always been acquired in this way. I do not remember ever "learning to read" as a set task. I am sure that none of my children ever did so. We recognized the desirability of knowing how. We wanted to learn, and so we learned; that is all. Of course our teachers and parents and friends helped us along.

Is not this what the school is for—to make the pupil anxious to learn and then to help him? When all schools are conducted on this principle, we shall be very happy, but apparently it is not so simple as it would appear.

What we should try to approximate, at all events, is an emancipation from the thralldom of unwillingness on the part of the pupil—to bring it about that he shall desire to learn and will take what measures he can to do so, gladly availing himself of what help we can offer him.

I have said that what we need is to stimulate the pupil's desire and then to satisfy it. I have known teachers who were competent to do both—who could take an ignorant, unwilling pupil and make of him an enthusiast, thirsting for knowledge, in a few weeks. We all know of the ideal university whose faculty consisted of Mark Hopkins on one end of a log. I am sorry the creator of that epigram put his teacher on a log. There are plenty of logs, and, from this fact, too many persons, I am afraid, have leaped to the conclusion that there are also plenty of Mark Hopkinses. I fear that one trouble with educators is that, hitching their wagons to stars, they have assumed the possibility that terrestrial luminaries also are able to raise us to the skies. If we had a million Mark Hopkinses, and a million boys for them to educate, we should need only a sufficient quantity of logs; we should be forever absolved from planning schoolhouses and making out schedules, from writing textbooks and establishing libraries. As it is, we must do all these things. We must adopt any and all devices to arouse and hold the pupil's interest, and we must similarly seek out and use all kinds of machinery to satisfy that interest when once aroused. Of these devices and machines, the individual teacher, with or without his textbooks, lectures, recitations, laboratory work, and formal courses, is only one, and perhaps in some cases not the one to be preferred as the primary agent. Among such devices I believe that a collection of books, properly selected, disposed, and used, can be made to play a very important part, both in arousing interest in a subject and in satisfying it—in other words, in teaching it properly.

And first let us see what it may do to stimulate a general interest in knowledge. Of late I have seen cropping out here and there what seems to me a pedagogical heresy—the thesis that no kind of training is of value in fitting the pupil for anything but the definite object that it has in view. We can, according to this

view, teach a boy to argue about triangles, but this will not help him in a legal or business discussion. We may teach him to solve equations, and he will then be an equation-solver—nothing else. We may teach him to read Greek and he will then be some sort of a Greek scholar, but his reaction to other attempts to teach him will not be affected. Anything like a general training is a contradiction in terms. If this is true, a great part of what I am saying is foolish, but I do not believe it. Doubtless we have exaggerated the effect of certain kinds of training. The old college graduate who, having been through four years of Latin, Greek, and mathematics, considered himself able, with slight additional training, to undertake to practice law or medicine or manage a parish, was probably too sanguine. Yet I refuse to believe that a man's brain is so shut off in knowledge-tight compartments that one may exercise one part of it without the slightest effect on the others, I cannot now write with my toes, but I am sure that I could learn to do so much more quickly because I know how to use my fingers for the purpose.

And it is indubitable, I think, that the best general preparation for mental activity of whatever kind is contact with the minds of others—early, late, and often. It tones up all one's reactions—makes him mentally stronger, quicker, and more accurate. Some children get this at home, where there is a numerous family of persons who are both thoughtful and mentally alert. Some meet at home, besides members of the family, visitors who add to the variety of their contacts. Few get it in school, with much variety. And it is futile to expect most of our children to get it anywhere directly from persons. This being the case, it is wonderfully fortunate that we have so many of the recorded souls of human beings, between the covers of books. With them mental contacts may be numerous, wide, and easy. To interest a man in a stretch of country take him up to a height whence he may overlook it. There is a patch of woods, there a hill, there is a winding stream. He will see in imagination the wild flowers under the trees, the wind-swept rocks behind the hill, the trout in the stream. He will wonder, too, what unimagined things there may be, and he will long to find out. To interest a pupil in a subject, turn him loose in a room containing a hundred books about it. He will browse

about, finding a dozen things that he understands and a hundred that he does not. He will get such a bird's-eye view that his stimulated imagination will long for closer acquaintance. And if you want to interest him in the world of ideas in general, turn him loose in a general library. The things that he will get are not to be ascertained by an examination. They are intangible, but their results are not.

In an illuminating article on the events just preceding the present European war, Professor Munroe Smith holds that it was precipitated chiefly by bringing to the front at every step military rather than diplomatic considerations. The trouble with military men, he says, is that they take no account of "imponderables"—by which he means public opinion, national feeling, injured pride, joy, grief—all those things, intellectual and emotional, that cannot be expressed in terms of men, guns, supplies, and military position. I have been wondering whether some other technically trained persons—educators, for instance, do not tend toward a similar neglect of imponderables, measuring educational values solely in terms of hours, and units, and the passing of examinations. It is a fault common to all highly trained specialists. The Scripture has a phrase for it, as for most things—"ye neglect the weightier matters of the law—judgment and faith." These, you will note, are to be classed with Professor Munroe Smith's "imponderables," whereas mint, anise, and cummin are commercial products.

At least one noted educator, William James, did not make this error, for he bids us note that the emotional "imponderable"—though he does not use this word—possesses the priceless property of unlocking within us unsuspected stores of energy and placing them at our disposal. "I thank thee, Roderick, for the word," says Fitz-James in "The Lady of the Lake": "it nerves my heart; it steels my sword." One would hardly expect to find educational psychology in Scott's verse, but here it is. The word that Roderick Dhu spoke (I forget just what it was, but I think he called his rival a bad name) unlocked in Fitz-James an unexpected store of reserve energy, and the result, as I recall it, was quite unfortunate from the Gaelic point of view. We cannot afford to neglect the imponderables; and it is their presence and their influence that

are fostered by a collection of books. If you will add together the weight of leather, paper, glue, thread, and ink in a book you will get the whole weight of the volume. There is naught ponderable left; and yet what is left is all that makes the thing a book—all that has power to influence the lives and souls of men—the imponderable part, fit for the unlocking of energies.

I would not have you think, although I believe this to be at bottom a matter of principles, that it is not possible to apply these principles very directly and concretely in the daily practice of an educational institution. I desire to call your attention for a moment to the testimony of one who has had great experience and practice in the administration of a collection of books in such an institution and in their use for the purposes already outlined—Mr. Frederick C. Hicks, assistant librarian of Columbia University, New York City, from whose recent review article on this subject I propose to quote a few paragraphs. Mr. Hicks is writing primarily of college instruction, but, as he notes in the first paragraph that I shall quote, what he says applies with equal cogency to the secondary school. He writes:

The general tendency in all instruction today, including even that in preparatory and high schools, is from what may be called the few-book method to the many-book method—a recognition of the power of the printed page for which librarians have always stood sponsor. The lecture, note-taking, textbook and quiz method of instruction is fast passing away in undergraduate as well as in graduate study. Textbooks are still in use in undergraduate and Master of Arts courses, but they have been relegated to a subordinate position. Emphasis is laid on work done and the assimilation of ideas gathered from many sources rather than upon memorizing the treatise of one author. Necessarily, references are chiefly to easily accessible works of secondary authority, and reading instead of research is the objective.

From the library point of view, the growth of the laboratory or case method of instruction appears to be an independent phenomenon. It should be noticed, however, that coincident with it is the general tendency to adopt a policy of teaching each subject with emphasis on its relations to other subjects.

Most universities now give courses for which no textbook is available. For instance, Professor Frederick J. Turner, of Harvard University, announces in a syllabus of 116 pages that there is no textbook suitable for use in his course on the History of the West in the United States. He thereupon gives citations to about 2,100 separate readings contained in 1,300 volumes, and says that his course requires not less than 120 pages of reading per week in

these books. Professor James Harvey Robinson's course in Columbia University on the History of the Intellectual Class in Western Europe has no textbook, and the reading for a class of 156 students is indicated in a pamphlet of 53 pages, containing references to 301 books. Illustrations could be taken from almost any subject in the university curriculum.

This is essentially a teacher's view. Listen now to that of a public librarian, Mr. John Cotton Dana, of Newark, New Jersey. He says:

In our high schools we spend literally millions of dollars to equip laboratories, kitchens, carpenter shops, machine shops, and what not, to be used by a small part of the pupils for a small part of the short school day. This is partly because so to do is the fashion of the hour, partly also because the products of work in those shops, kitchens, and laboratories can be seen, touched, and handled, are real things even to the most unintelligent.

For books, the essential tools of every form of acquisition, we spend, outside of textbooks, a few paltry thousands. The things a child makes we can see, and we are impressed by them; the knowledge he gains, the power of thought he acquires—these cannot be made visible and are not appreciated by the ignorant; they can only be certified to by the teacher and demonstrated by the student's words and deeds as he goes through life.

Mastery of print is mastery of world-knowledge. Our young people do not have it. Surely they should be led to acquire it, and where better than in the high schools? To aid them in this acquisition the high schools should have ample collections of books, and these collections of books should become active teaching organisms through the ministrations of competent librarians.

Of all teaching laboratories, there is one which is plainly of supreme importance—that of books.

I trust that you are with me so far; for I am about to make a further advance that experience teaches me is very difficult, except for librarians. I am going to urge that your collection of books, when you have made it, be put in charge of one who has studied the methods of making the contents of books available to the reader—their shelving, physical preparation, classification, cataloguing; the ways in which to fit them to their users, to record their use, and to prevent their abuse. This means a trained librarian.

In all departments where expert knowledge and skill are necessary it is difficult to explain to a non-expert the reasons for this necessity and exactly in what the expert knowledge consists. We are so accustomed to accept the fact in certain departments

that it passes there without question. Unfortunately that is not the case with the selection and administration of a library. Most persons understand quite well that special training is necessary before one can practice law, or medicine, or engineering. No one would undertake to drive a motor car or even ride a bicycle without some previous experience; but it is quite usual to believe that a collection of books may be administered and its use controlled by totally untrained and inexperienced persons—a retired clergyman, a broken-down clerk, a janitor, perhaps. I once asked a young woman who came for advice about taking up library work what had inclined her toward that particular occupation. She was quite frank with me; she said: "Why, my father and mother didn't think I was good for anything else." This estimate of the library is by no means confined to the parents of would-be library workers. And even where it is recognized that some training and experience are necessary in administering a large public institution, there is a lingering feeling that a comparatively small collection, like that in a school, needs no expert supervision. The fact that there are in a school plenty of experts in other lines seems to have been not without its effect on this attitude. "Why, Professor Smith is one of the best chemists in the state; Miss Jones is an acknowledged authority on oriental history; do you mean to tell me that either of them would not make a perfectly satisfactory librarian?" Which is something like saying, "Mr. Robinson is our foremost banker; should he not be able to superintend the dyeing department in a textile mill?" Or, "Rev. Mr. Jenkins is our most eloquent pulpit orator; he can surely run the 2:15 express!"

Are my metaphors too violent? I think not. We are dealing here with imponderables, as I have said, but the most imponderable thing of all, and the most potent, is the human mind. To wield, concentrate, and control our battery of energies, we want a correlated energy—one whose relations to them all are close and one who knows how to pull all the throttles, turn all the valves, and operate all the mechanism that brings them into play. It takes two years of hard work, nowadays, for a college graduate to get through a library school, and it should not be necessary to argue that during these two years he is working hard on essentials and is

assimilating material that the untrained man however able, cannot possibly acquire in a few months' casual association with a library or from mere association with books, no matter how long or how intimate. You will pardon me, I am sure, some further quotation from Mr. Hicks's illuminating article. After calling our attention to the fact that the effort to meet changing conditions in instruction is purely technical, he goes on:

The librarian stands in the position of an engineer to whom is presented a task which by the methods of his profession he must perform. Numerical growth, expansion, addition of new schools and new subjects, and the introduction of the laboratory method by which books are made actual tools for use, all mean to the librarian more books, larger reading-rooms and more of them, a large staff specialized and grouped into departments, the supervision of a complicated system, and capable business administration. These are all technical matters and are of sufficient magnitude to require all of the time and strength of those to whom they are entrusted. . . .

In a reference library, open shelves, whether in department libraries or in the general library, require much high-grade library service. The reference librarian becomes a direct teacher in the use of books and gives constant assistance not merely in finding separate books but in dealing with the whole literature of a subject. . . .

The whole development from the few-book method to the many-book method presupposes a system of reserve books. By this expression is meant the placing of a collection of books behind an enclosure of some kind from which they are given out by a library assistant for use in the room. The reserve collections, continually changing in accordance with the directions of instructors, are in reality composite textbooks. . . .

The mere clerical work of maintaining an efficient reserve system is large, its success being dependent upon intelligent co-operation between the teaching faculty and the library, but it involves also a technical problem to be solved by the librarian. What relation does the number of copies of a given reserve book bear to its use? To put the question concretely, how many copies of a book are required to supply a class of 200 students, all of whom must read thirty pages of the book within two weeks?

I like so much one of Mr. Hicks's expressions that I desire to emphasize it at the close of what I am saying. A library, used for teaching purposes in a school, is indeed "a composite textbook." It insures contact with a composite instead of a single mind. The old idea was that contact of this kind always resulted in confusion—in mental instability. There was a time when the effort was to protect the mind through life from any such unbalancing

contact. The individual was protected from familiarity with more than one set of opinions—religious, political, social, philosophical, scientific. He was taught facts as facts and no emphasis was placed on the more important fact that there are degrees of certainty and points of view. The next step was to give the individual a free head after the formal processes of education had terminated. Getting out of college was like escaping from a box, where one had been shut up with Presbyterians and Free Traders and Catastrophists and Hegelians—or their opposites, for the contents of all the boxes were not alike. Now, we set the boy free when he enters college and this meeting is an evidence that we are beginning to give him a little fresh air in the high school. Why not go back to the beginning? Why not, at any rate, avoid the implication that there is the same backing behind all that we teach or tell? Some teachers, and some parents, have made this plan succeed. One of them is Mr. H. R. Walmsley, who writes in the *Volta Review* (Washington, April, 1915), on "How I Taught My Boy the Truth." Says he:

I pondered over these things, and determined that I would never tell a falsehood to my child; that I would tell him the truth upon every subject, and that I would not evade or refuse to answer any question. I kept my resolution and have obtained most excellent results. The child doubted nothing I told him. He knew that as far as I was able I would reply truthfully to any question he might care to ask. In answering him I was always careful to qualify my statements thus: "This is so," "I believe so," "It is believed to be," "It is claimed to be," "Those who should know say," etc. So he knew the basis from which I spoke. Throughout his life, when he was told anything that looked doubtful, he would say, "I will ask father."

This plan is practicable from the child's earliest years. As soon as he learns to read we may begin to supplement it by reference to original documents. This means a library at the very beginning, and at high school age it means a large library. It need not all be in the school. In the smallest towns there are now respectable public collections; the school may confine itself to the subjects in its own curriculum. But whatever we do, let us not teach the child, with the implication of equal authority, that twice two is four, that material bodies are composed of molecules, and that the Tories in the Revolution were all bad. Tell him that there are other aspects, if they exist, and as soon as he is able let him ex-

amine those aspects. He will be able far sooner than some of us are willing to admit.

We librarians feel somewhat strongly on this matter because our own institutions possess by their very nature that form of neutrality that exposes both sides without advocating either. It seems to be assumed by some persons that neutrality means ignorance. Of course, ignorance is one method of insuring it. If a fairy story opens with the announcement that the King of Nowaria is at war with the Prince of Sumboddia, you cannot take sides until you know something about the quarrel. The trouble is that we do not live in fairyland. In my home city the school authorities have been trying to cultivate this kind of neutrality by cautioning principals not to discuss the European war with their pupils. What is the result? One of my branch librarians says in a recent report: "I have been greatly interested by the fact that the high-school boys and girls never ask for anything about the war. Not once during the winter have I seen in one of them a spark of interest in the subject. It seems so strange that it should be necessary to keep them officially ignorant of this great war because the grandfather of one spoke French and of another, German." With this I thoroughly agree. I am not sure that I do not prefer thorough and bigoted partisanship to this neutrality of ignorance. Better than both is the opportunity for free investigation with enlightened guidance. The public library offers the opportunity for the fullest and freest contact with the minds of the world. We try to give guidance, also, as we can; but we have not the opportunities of you teachers. Guidance is your business and your high privilege; and if some of you have in the past guided as the jailer guides his prisoners—for a walk around the prison yard with ball and chain—let us be thankful that this oppressive view is giving place to the freer idea of a guide as a counselor and friend. Such guidance means intellectual freedom. Freedom means choice, and choice implies a collection from which to choose. This means a library and the school library is thus an indispensable tool in the hands of those teachers to whom education signifies neutral training, the arousing of neutral energies, and a control of the imponderables of life—those things without physical weight which yet count more in the end than all the masses with which molecular physics has to deal.

AN OBJECTIVE STUDY OF THE RATING OF TRAITS IN SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT

W. F. ROECKER

Wisconsin High School of the University of Wisconsin

In the Wisconsin High School report cards are issued every six weeks. These reports contain not only marks in scholarship, but also ratings in each of the five traits—industry, initiative, attention, attitude, and improvement. A copy of the report card is herewith given to indicate the form and manner in which these marks and ratings are recorded.

THE WISCONSIN HIGH SCHOOL OF

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Report of in School year
..... Teacher

Date of Report.....						
Scholarship.....						
Traits						
1. Industry.....						
2. Initiative.....						
3. Attention.....						
4. Attitude.....						
5. Improvement..						
Times absent.....						
Times tardy.....						

In scholarship records, E indicates excellent; G, good; F, fair; P, passable (not recommended for college entrance); N, failure. Promotion is determined primarily on scholarship records. Each report is an estimate of the pupil's work and a record of attendance from the first day of the school year (or quarter in part-year subjects) to the date of the report.—A, B, and C are used to indicate the ratings in the following traits: Industry, initiative, attention, attitude, and improvement. A represents a high, B a medium, and C a low degree, quality, or amount of the trait. Mark in [] is an estimate of the work for the past weeks.

Teachers have learned by training and experience how to evaluate scholarship with reasonable accuracy; as a rule it is quite possible to get sufficient objective evidence by which to determine what mark a pupil should have. To give equally true ratings in the five traits mentioned is not such an easy matter, for people differ greatly in their conception of what these traits really are, and even if they did agree substantially on this point, it is difficult to attach these abstract terms to objective data which will give us the necessary assurance that the ratings are reliable and fair.

The first difficulty has been overcome in our school by mutually defining these traits in an acceptable manner so that each teacher may aim approximately at the same thing when rating pupils in any one of these traits. These definitions are found on the reverse side of the report card and are as follows:

Industry represents working power applied continuously and actively in the mastery of assignments. It is the quality of response a pupil exhibits in the daily preparation of lessons, either under self-direction at home or under partial supervision in the school. The test of industry lies in the character of the results of study as revealed in the recitation.

Initiative represents the ability to plan and to execute; the ability to go forward without detailed oversight. The pupil who works with a purpose, more or less independently, gives evidence of initiative.

Attention consists in withholding thought from diverting subjects and fixing it upon the problem in hand. Practically, attention means thoughtfulness. It is the ability to stick to a subject, to think it through, and to test conclusions.

Attitude represents the disposition of a pupil toward the work of the school. Questions like the following are raised in determining the character of a pupil's attitude: Does he show a willingness to respond to the demands of the teacher? Does he regard the preparation of his lessons as serious business? Does he co-operate in advancing the interests of the class?

Improvement represents the amount of progress and accomplishment.

In the absence of any specific material outside of that used to evaluate the scholarship of the pupil, these ratings are usually made according to the teacher's judgment. They can therefore, hardly be impersonal; further, be they ever so correct, it is quite impossible to base them on the rock of tangible evidence. Such judgments are influenced directly by attainment in scholarship; often they are strongly tinged by the more recent impressions

received; at times even a few very strong impressions may control the judgment.

This year, in the classes in chemistry and physics, an attempt has been made to overcome this difficulty by securing some simple, tangible material, independent of that representing scholarship, which may serve as a continuous function of the traits actually displayed in the classroom. The regular assignment pad of the school is used for this purpose. Daily assignments are made in duplicate much like the grocer takes down an order; one of the copies is filed with the teacher when the pupil leaves the classroom.

This pad serves an additional purpose in the foregoing two classes. With each written assignment a special question is given which may be answered on the assignment slip at any time during the class period. These questions are not given primarily for the purpose of quizzing, but are intended to be thought-provoking; they refer to subject-matter recently studied and usually call for a special interpretation of some fact or principle emphasized in a previous lesson. The teacher promptly marks the answers received correct, C, wrong, X, partly right, $\frac{1}{2}$, or unanswered, o. After peculiar errors have been corrected at the next recitation the slips are properly filed.

Following are typical questions asked in this connection:

1. Why cannot nitric acid be used in the preparation of hydrogen?
2. How may hydrogen be distinguished from carbon monoxid?
3. How much does a mole of sulphuric acid weigh?

At the end of each six-week period the numerical data indicated in Table I are readily obtained.

The ratings in industry, initiative, attention, and attitude are first determined; then scholarship is entered from entirely independent records; finally the rating in improvement is obtained together from the first four traits and the scholarship by comparison with previous marks. The percentage of questions actually answered whether right or wrong, is here considered a function of the pupil's initiative. One-fourth of the class having highest percentages are marked A, one-fourth having the lowest percentages are marked C, and the rest are marked B. In the same manner the ratings on industry are distributed from the column showing the

percentage of questions correctly answered; those on attention are determined from the column showing the percentage of the answers

TABLE I*

Chemistry Number and Name	Reports	Questions	Answers	Answers Percentage Questions	Correct Answers	Correct Answers Percentage Questions	Correct Answers Percentage Answers	Industry	Initiative	Attention	Attitude	Improvement	Scholarship
1.....	23	17	13	77	2	12	16	C	B	C	B	C	P
2.....	19	13	8	61	3	23	37	B	C	C	B	C	N
3.....	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	C	C	C	B	C	N
4.....	20	14	14	100	9	64	64	A	B	C	C	C	F-
5.....	22	17	12	70	3	18	25	C	C	C	C	C	P
6.....	14	10	6	60	0	0	0	C	C	C	C	C	N
7.....	17	12	5	42	2	16	40	C	C	B	C	C	P
8.....	21	14	3	21	1	7	33	C	C	C	B	B	P
9.....	23	17	11	65	4	23	36	B	B	B	B	B	F
10.....	25	18	14	78	5	28	36	B	B	C	B	B	F
11.....	25	20	17	85	10	50	59	B	B	B	A	A	F
12.....	23	17	14	82	7	41	50	B	B	B	A	A	G+
13.....	27	21	19	90	14	66	74	A	B	A	A	A	G
14.....	24	18	16	89	11	61	69	B	B	A	A	A	Ex
15.....	25	18	15	83	7	39	47	B	B	A	B	A	F+
16.....	25	20	19	95	15	75	79	A	A	A	A	A	Ex
17.....	27	21	21	100	19	94	94	A	A	A	A	A	Ex
18.....	15	11	8	73	3	27	37	B	A	B	C	A	P+
19.....	27	21	20	96	16	76	80	A	A	A	A	B	G+
20.....	21	19	19	100	12	63	63	B	A	B	B	B	G
21.....	15	12	11	93	4	33	36	B	B	B	C	A	F-
22.....	28	21	18	86	14	66	78	A	B	A	A	A	G
23.....	26	19	15	76	5	26	33	B	B	C	A	C	F-
24.....	8	7	5	71	3	43	60	B	B	B	C	B	P-
25.....	22	16	16	100	8	50	50	B	B	B	B	B	P+
26.....	24	19	10	52	4	21	40	C	A	B	B	B	P
27.....	27	20	20	100	14	70	70	A	A	A	A	A	Ex
28.....	24	19	14	74	5	26	36	B	B	A	B	B	F

* Special note is made of the number of reports handed in, the number of questions encountered, the number of answers given, and the number of correct answers. The percentage of questions answered, the percentage of questions answered correctly, and the percentage of answers which proved correct are then determined.

which proved correct; those on attitude are determined from the number of reports handed in, after due allowance has been made for absences.

The percentages used for rating may be increased by doing special tasks, such as making special reports, making a chart,

doing an extra experiment, or assisting in setting up demonstration apparatus. The teacher prepares slips with directions for these tasks. Volunteers select such work as they desire and then, whether the work is done promptly and acceptably or not, the slips are filed, giving credit accordingly.

The results thus far obtained are quite satisfactory.

1. The general correlation between the traits and scholarship is high, although some of these traits were determined by factors entirely foreign to material used for the evaluation of scholarship.

2. The pupil is offered a continuous opportunity to determine in a definite and concrete way what his traits are, without the injection of the personal factor of the teacher.

3. The pupil is able to determine the weaknesses which appear to account for his lack of achievement.

4. The teacher gets daily a definite reaction from every pupil in the class and thus is enabled to learn to what extent his work has really been stimulating.

5. If we accept the assumption that these traits are determining factors in scholarship, it appears that they are general enough to function similarly in activities where scholarship is not the primary aim.

6. There is a very close correlation between industry and attention, omitting native ability as a factor.

7. This study furnishes material whereby the native ability of the pupil may ultimately be approximated. For this purpose the records from other teachers would be needed.

8. Even if the teacher's judgment could determine these traits equally as well as they are determined here, it could not meet inquiry and criticism by concrete evidence.

9. The scheme here used can be carried out in a short time.

NOTE.—The reader is reminded that this is only a study, as the title indicates. The chief value which such studies offer is not in the finality of the results but in the possibilities which the teacher can find in submitting his teaching to such types of analysis.

EDUCATIONAL NEWS AND EDITORIAL COMMENT

THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS IN GERMANY

A comparison of the training of teachers in Germany with that in the United States must take into consideration two important differences in the status of the profession in the two countries. First, almost all the teachers in boys' schools (both the *Volksschules* and the *Gymnasium*) are men. In 1911 there were 148,217 men and but 39,268 women teaching in the *Volksschule*, though boys and girls were numerically equal, the total number of pupils being 10,300,000. *Gymnasium* teachers are all men. Women never instruct boys, except in the lower grades and in small rural communities.

The second difference is that in Germany an appointment in either branch of the school system is for life: teaching is a life-occupation. Moreover, the comparatively good salaries and the certainty of a pension at sixty-five, as in any other branch of government service, and other causes, insure many more applications for positions than can be accepted. The result is severe competition and the elimination of weak candidates through searching entrance-examinations. In Prussia only one-third of the candidates for training are accepted; the average for the Empire is 50 per cent. Germany has, then, for both the *Volksschule* and the *Gymnasium* a body of candidates much more adaptable to thorough professional training than the prospective teachers of corresponding schools in the United States. In America the average tenure of office is five years, and 90 per cent of the teachers are women.

These essential differences explain in part the superiority of the German professional preparation. The special training of secondary-school teachers in both branches is characterized by two features indifferently administered in American normal schools and universities. These two features are the examinations and the pronounced emphasis upon practice teaching. To the *Volksschule* seminar, corresponding to the normal schools of the United States, admission is gained by rigid oral and written examination. At the conclusion of the seminar course candidates are again subjected to an examination, conducted by a government commission. The successful candidates finally receive

* For a full discussion consult the United States Bureau of Education *Bulletin* No. 35, 1914, by Charles H. Judd.

certificates, but are required after two years' experience in teaching to undergo still a third examination. When this is successfully passed, candidates are at last assured of life-positions.

More important is the second feature—two years' work in practice teaching. This work has several important features. First, model lessons are presented by seminar teachers before the candidates. Secondly, there is the preparation in writing of trial lessons (both form and content), during the preparation of which several students may take charge of the class. Thirdly, throughout the entire last year of the seminar, students are required to conduct from four to six periods of continuous instruction in the practice school under the direction of the seminar teachers.

Candidates for teaching positions in the *Gymnasias* are graduates of the universities, most of them having received a Doctor's degree. They, too, undergo most formidable examinations conducted by special commissions. Moreover—

after the examination the successful candidate now has before him two years of contact with the classroom before he can become a teacher with a regular position. The first of these trial years is known as the seminar year and the second as the trial year. During both of these periods the candidate is connected with one of the secondary schools, assigned to it by the government officers, and is under the general direction of the principal or director of the school.

In other words, the candidate becomes, in the strictest sense of the word, an apprentice, visiting and observing, helping the regular workers to teach, and meeting periodically for consultation with the director and to present reports. After one year of this preliminary work, candidates are allowed to give six to eight hours a week instruction in the presence of the regular teachers.

These two features—the elimination of unfit candidates by examination, and a thorough system of apprenticeship—constitute the essence of the "special, rigid training of the secondary-school teachers," which "stand out as perhaps the most significant" characteristics of the German school system.

VALUELESS COURSES IN METHODS

"I enjoyed my work in the Principles and Method of Teaching, but I do not find that I can make very much use of it in my present position." That it is to this effect that we often hear normal-school, college, and university graduates speaking, is the assertion of Mr. Frank P. Bachman.

The truth of his statement is evident from the almost universal criticism of classroom instruction by educational experts, who are conducting school surveys the country over. The fact is that courses in the methods of teaching, whether general courses or courses devoted to the teaching of a single subject, are usually vague, theoretical, and widely divorced from intimate contact with actual schoolroom situations.

Consider a course in methods as it is too frequently conducted. The work consists of the perusal of one of the many textbooks on classroom management, accompanied by supplementary lectures upon such topics as the aims of high-school instruction, the organization of the courses of study, the five formal steps of a recitation, and the like. If a model school is available, students go in a mass or singly to observe a few classes. They make approximately one visit a week, sometimes accompanied by their instructor. Following these visits there are more or less informal discussions of miscellaneous classroom situations observed. Sometimes the students write reports of their observations. Still further to pad out his course, an instructor frequently requires report of readings, or term papers on the pedagogical aspects of his special subject. In the preparation of these papers students mull over the painfully thin contributions which fill the pages of the far too numerous educational periodicals. Few of these articles deal with actual facts. Most of them are the vapid theorizings of teachers who desire to "get into print" and, to do so, write colorless discussions based upon inadequate data.

So conducted, courses in methods cannot be too heartily condemned. They are utterly unfitted for developing anything like skill in the solution of problems in actual teaching. It is barely conceivable that a boy might learn how bricks are laid, if he put in his apprenticeship by standing over an artisan and watching him lay a few thousand bricks; especially if at the side of the student there is a supposedly past-master of bricklaying, telling him how the workman is handling his trowel, and how edges are chipped off the bricks. The observer might even learn how bricks are laid by reading about the art in carefully written expository manuals; especially if the expert is present to elucidate processes not clearly expressed. The observer might even write a paper on the laying of fire brick, as contrasted with the laying of plain brick, after having prepared a bibliography and a brief upon the subject. By such methods an extraordinary observer might eventually learn *how* bricks are laid, but he would never acquire skill in laying bricks. Such a bricklayer, supposing for a minute, that he gained admittance to a

union, might well say when facing his first job: "I enjoyed my work in learning how to lay brick, but I can't make very much use of it in my present position."

Now the handling of a class in history or mathematics or English is not completely analogous to the laying of brick. Situations faced by a teacher are not $8' \times 4'$, nor are they solved by manual dexterity. Judgment, tact, knowledge of human nature, are far more difficult to attain than muscular effort. Nevertheless, the process of acquiring skill in teaching is in some respects analogous to the acquiring of the brick-layer's skill. Apprenticeship—actually performing the necessary operations—is universally indispensable for acquiring skill. It is true in all manual crafts, it is so in surgery, in dentistry, in law, to a certain extent in the ministry, in the diplomatic service. It is no less true in teaching. If what has just been stated is accurate, normal and university courses in methods of teaching can be of real value only in so far as they involve actual participation by prospective teachers in classroom problems.

PRACTICE TEACHING VERSUS REAL APPRENTICESHIP

American educators, working with young men and women most of whom unfortunately regard their teaching career as a temporary make-shift, have long recognized that practice teaching is indispensable. Model schools abound. Young women labor in them faithfully in duties carefully prescribed and criticized. The main difficulty is that except for meager preparation in subject-matter and a few courses in methods, practice teaching has no prerequisites. Thorough entrance examinations are unknown. The almost universal cry for growth in numbers is in this respect an unmitigated curse. Partly, then, through the natural shortcomings of the teaching profession in America, and partly because of the soft-heartedness of the promotion system, practice teaching is often feeble in the extreme.

But the signs of reawakening are at hand. Today we find many departments of education insisting upon a meaningful apprenticeship. This is the case in the University of Iowa. In the high school of the University of Wisconsin there is an intimate connection between the courses in methods and actual classroom experience. Harvard University has an arrangement with the city schools in Newton, by which apprenticeship is secured for prospective teachers. Equally promising is the movement in many states for apprentice teachers. Candidates for the city school system, if inexperienced, are required to attach

themselves, for an entire year or two, to the schools, acting as assistant teachers. Most American cities, using this plan, allow a small stipend, half-pay in some instances, for this service; in Germany, on the contrary, the seminar and trial years are spent without pay. The University of Cincinnati co-operates closely with the city schools. In New York, Columbia and other institutions are co-operating with the city schools by placing half-time students as assistant teachers. There is coming to the fore everywhere something resembling the German system of apprenticeship—learn by doing, learn not in the somewhat strained situations of a model-school classroom, but by subordinate participation in everyday problems of the city schoolroom. This is real apprenticeship.

Is there then no place for courses in method? Yes, there is a subordinate place. Professional equipment quite apart from skill is highly desirable. Moreover, such courses, in an institution in which the practice schools and the normal department are properly co-ordinated, may wisely be made the means of checking up the experiences of practice teaching. In the classrooms of these special courses, the preparation of apprentices may be supervised, their problem discussed, and their questions answered. The instructor of the courses in methods can relieve his colleagues in the practice schools of much of the labor incident to the handling of practice teaching. This one point must never be overlooked. The net product of special courses in method must not be as in the past "too much theory," "too much talking," the comment which Superintendent Kendell reports as being most frequent. The net product of the courses in method must rest solidly upon practical experience in teaching through apprenticeship.

TRAINING COURSES IN BOSTON AND MINNEAPOLIS

In April the School Board of Boston adopted a course in training for high-school teachers similar to the plan for elementary teachers which for some time has been in use in that city. The essence of the plan is a two-year apprenticeship in the high school under the general supervision of the department of practice and training. Concerning this plan the *Boston Post* gives the following details: Candidates for the schools of Boston are admitted only upon examination, which emphasizes practical classroom experience. Inexperienced candidates are given a thorough course in practical work, covering a period of two years. This plan is based upon the requirement that the candidate must have had a year's

work in secondary education, either in a regular college course, or in postgraduate study. The salary for the first year is \$800, and \$900 for the second.

Boston is a typical example of a city school system which is planning to secure desirable candidates by thorough examinations and to insure preliminary training resembling the German system of apprenticeship for the *Gymnasium*.

In co-operation with the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis is also adopting a system of "traveling assistants" who are to receive credit in the University toward a degree, for their apprenticeship in the city schools. Professor F. H. Swift and Superintendent F. E. Spaulding have matured the plans; their administration will be in the hands of Raymond A. Kent, principal of the University High School.

Certificates will be issued by the Minneapolis high-school authorities to those who take the course, attesting their fitness for positions as "teaching assistants." The plan is really an effort toward the introduction of a fifth year of professional training which the University authorities expect eventually to require of all students preparing for the teaching profession.

Important features of the plan provide that:

"Graduates of the University to be eligible must have fulfilled the requirements for the University state teacher's certificate.

"The period of professional study and training for such teaching assistants may extend over one year and one summer-school session or over two years, omitting attendance upon a summer session as follows:

"One year of advanced professional graduate study at the University combined with teaching in the Minneapolis high schools, followed by attendance upon one summer-school session at the University of Minnesota or elsewhere, shall entitle one to at least six professional credits.

"Two years of graduate professional study at the University, combined with teaching in the Minneapolis high schools without attendance upon summer school, shall constitute the two years' course.

"Certificates or diplomas shall be granted by the Minneapolis school authorities, and indorsed by some University authority.

"Certificate shall contain a statement of the amount and quality of the recipient's teaching and of the professional course pursued."

Superintendent Spaulding said of the new plans that graduates of the University will be selected for these positions by the school authorities upon the same general basis as other teachers are selected.

"The compensation, \$300, is as nearly as possible proportionate to what is paid regular first-year teachers," Dr. Spaulding said. "They will not be permitted to do more than two hours of actual teaching per day during their first year, nor more than three hours per day the second year. They will devote

no time outside school hours to school work other than preparation for the classes they teach. Regular teachers, on the other hand, spend a large amount of time daily after school hours, recording marks, correcting papers, and doing various other things."

MISDIRECTED INVESTIGATION PROPERLY CHARACTERIZED

President Herman C. Bumpus of Tufts College, formerly business manager of the University of Wisconsin, in an address before the Brown University Teachers Association, on April 17, thus comments on the recent investigation of the University of Wisconsin:

Three or four years ago, when the lost motions of the bricklayer were being capitalized and Success Magazines were going into the hands of receivers, certain efficiency experts were assigned to "speed up" the University of Wisconsin, that held at that time the foremost position among publicly supported educational institutions. I happened to be where I could watch the working of this "efficiency process" during a period of three or four years, indeed, up to the time of its complete collapse as an instrument of educational betterment.

The men assigned as efficiency experts began with the business side of college administration; they were not college men, but accountants, men ignorant of college purposes, out of sympathy with college ideals, arrogantly insisting upon the abolition of long-established methods that they did not care to understand, and arbitrarily insistent upon the introduction of fantastic methods repugnant to the purposes of an educational institution.

One evening I was called aside and told with all the secrecy that envelops the report of a Pinkerton detective that evidence had been unearthed which provided conclusively that students were receiving instruction at less than cost. The efficiency expert gasped for air when assured that his discovery was probably true, and that the state actually paid two million and a half each year for the privilege of being swindled in this way. Then followed a recommendation that the administrative staff of clerks, accountants, etc., could be reduced by one-half through the adoption of certain efficiency devices. Methods were put into execution, the staff was disorganized, the loss of records was irreparable and the so-called process of economy resulted in doubling the cost of operation through the introduction of perfectly useless machinery.

A chronic condition of disturbance and unrest is bad for the business side of a university, but it is almost fatal when the instructional side becomes infected. The injury that the University of Wisconsin has suffered since the inquisitorial methods of so-called efficiency experts invaded the educational side of the institution is irreparable. For over a year an educational staff costing the state a million and a half has had its attention and its energies diverted from its

legitimate work and centered upon the formulation of protests against unwarranted interference, unfair misrepresentation, and against the ruthless destruction of long-established educational ideals.

Through a grilling fire of official questionnaires—those diabolical instruments of intellectual destruction—the student was compelled to attack the teaching staff, and each member of the teaching staff felt that he must answer questions reflecting upon the capacity of his colleagues. Misunderstandings between the faculty and the governing board multiplied, and the governing board then had its troubles with the state authorities. Tired of turmoil, some of the faculty are seeking employment elsewhere; the overthrow of the entire administration is threatened; the legislature is hostile and plans to cut the appropriations; new construction has ceased, and we witness the sad sight of an institution made desolate by an unnecessary and inexcusable reality, that under the name of “constructional work” has wrought destruction and under the name of efficiency has wrought havoc.

It has not been my intention to imply that the efficiency of universities cannot be increased; it has been my intention to imply that efficiency cannot be increased through the investigations or advice of those who are ignorant of university purposes and out of sympathy with university methods.

STATEMENTS OF THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Apart from the merits of the controversy in the University of Utah, comment may be made upon the statement of the Regents recently made in response to a request of a group of alumni. The seemingly restrained and sensible tone of the statement is grateful. Here is a brief extract:

It is asserted that these resigning professors “stand on holy ground.” If such be the case, is it impious for us to suggest that the ninety or so teachers who have not resigned stand on unholy ground? Is it not quite logical to conclude that they are either devoid of conscience or, as opportunists, have compromised with their consciences in order to save their salaries?

But rather do we reach the conclusion that the gentlemen who have resigned did so hastily and without due consideration. We regret this inconsiderate action, so far, at least, as concerns the majority of them, since we are thus deprived of the services of competent men whose positions it may possibly be difficult to fill. It seems relevant, however, here to note that the reasons now assigned by some, at least, of the resigning professors are quite complex when compared with the simple reasons given by them in their letters of resignation.

The attitude of the Board does not arise from the arrogant assumption that it is infallible. Whatever the issue in the beginning of this controversy may have been, it has now become: Shall the Regents exercise their discretion in the control of the University, or shall they surrender that discretion and

control to any group of instructors who may feel themselves to be wronged and who may arouse the public to their support, or to the faculty as a whole, or to your committee, able and trustworthy as it unquestionably is?

This we are prevented from doing because of our deep consciousness that, on the whole, we are right, and from our unwillingness to create a precedent under which the ultimate control of the University shall be submitted to a mass meeting rather than to the determination and discretion of the Board.

COMMISSIONER SNEDDEN ON THE NEW HIGH SCHOOL

(From an address before the Philadelphia High-School Teachers' Association, March 20, 1915)

We can work out a satisfactory program of liberal or cultural education only by going into the world of active life, where men and women from twenty to fifty years of age are found, and from a study of the valuable and enduring qualities here found, deriving standards of personal cultivation, social leadership, and character, which shall constitute a basis for constructing a sound program of liberal education. I can readily imagine that this process might give us a new high-school program in which we should have no algebra, no Latin, no French, no German, no physics, no chemistry, and no ancient history as these subjects are now taught, but in which, nevertheless, we should do much more than we are now doing to make the liberal-minded men and women whom the twentieth century needs as leaders among its citizens, as sources of good example among its men and women. Perhaps under such general designations as social science studies, natural science studies approached from the standpoint of appreciation, mental science studies, contemporary English literature, the speaking and writing of good English, the appreciation of fine and applied art, the study of contemporary history as that history is now being made, we shall be able to build up programs that will genuinely assist our youth to possess themselves, to the maximum possible extent, of the social inheritance which should be theirs.

The new high school will teach some things for the primary purpose of producing in the learner the capacity *to do, to execute, to achieve* definite results in important fields. On the other hand, it will teach some other things with the primary end in view of procuring *appreciation, comprehension*, and the other qualities that make the consumer or utilizer a good consumer or utilizer. It will surely teach English language primarily with a view to producing ability to speak and write good English. But, it will teach poetry primarily from the standpoint of making a good reader, appreciator, or utilizer of poetry—a very different thing. When a foreign language is taught, the object will be to have the student learn to use the foreign language, either as a medium of thought-getting or of thought expression, in a definite and precise way. On the other hand, it may teach some pupils *about* a foreign language with very different ends in view.

A SCHOLARSHIP BULLETIN

Principal C. D. Donaldson of the Coleraine, Minnesota, High School, sends to the *School Review* the following scholarship bulletin for the month of March.

SCHOLARSHIP BULLETIN

GREENWAY HIGH SCHOOL

For School Month Ending March 26, 1915

Average standings with which parents may compare the standings of their children.

	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	March
Freshman Class.....	83.77	84.58	84.11	85.06	80.95	82.83	84.44
Boys.....	82.49	82.84	83.25	83.03	77.96	79.72	82.60
Girls.....	85.89	87.28	86.48	88.35	85.05	88.17	87.61
Sophomore Class.....	86.34	87.30	85.18	86.37	84.29	86.12	87.22
Boys.....	86.08	87.03	84.30	87.17	83.55	86.58	87.66
Girls.....	86.55	87.50	85.83	85.77	85.18	85.79	86.81
Junior Class.....	83.83	84.33	83.13	85.30	84.00	84.41	84.45
Boys.....	82.48	83.06	79.86	83.06	82.28	82.03	81.90
Girls.....	85.18	85.60	86.39	87.72	85.71	86.79	87.01
Senior Class.....	86.87	86.04	86.58	86.45	85.92	87.11	86.70
Boys.....	85.00	82.49	83.75	82.26	85.85	84.61	84.57
Girls.....	87.50	87.62	87.84	88.31	85.96	87.95	87.65
School.....							
Boys.....	83.60	83.90	82.42	84.01	81.80	82.91	84.03
Girls.....	86.30	87.04	86.57	87.37	85.49	87.01	87.22

COLERAINE, MINNESOTA

March 29, 1915

C. D. DONALDSON, *Principal*

Mr. Donaldson writes that a copy of this bulletin is sent to the parents of all pupils in the high school, on the first Monday of each month. The bulletin is displayed also in the form of a large chart drawn upon the board in the general assembly room. It is accompanied by a second chart drawn to scale, in colors, the graph of each class first, second, third, and fourth year being shown. A third chart indicates the comparative grades of the boys and girls.

By these means parents are enabled to compare the scholarship of their child with the general scholarship of his class, of the boys and girls in each class, and of the entire school. Largely owing to the stimulating effects of this device, the Greenway High School shows but 8 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent of pupils below the passing mark. Teachers and principals believe that ultimately the percentage of pupils failing to pass will be reduced to 4 or 5 per cent.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Church School. By WALTER S. ATHEARN. Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1914. Pp. 320. \$1.00 net.

In the last twenty years great progress has been made in religious education. The leaders of the church have realized that the Sunday school was lagging far behind the advancement of educational thought and practice. School men have been called in to help in the reorganization of the educational work of the church. Among these is Professor Athearn, who holds the chair of religious education in Drake University. He has served as chairman of a commission of the Religious Education Association, which has studied the problem of the correlation of religious educational agencies in the local church. There is much waste and inefficiency as a result of the want of such correlation. This book is the outgrowth of the studies of the commission, and its title indicates that the church school is a much larger institution than the Sunday school. The book deals with the methods by which the necessary reorganization may be effected. It contains complete references to all the best literature on the subject and full directions for securing all available religious educational material. It is a valuable guidebook for all students of the Sunday-school problem, and will inevitably be a great factor in effecting needed reforms.

THEODORE GERALD SOARES

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Commercial Education in Germany. By FREDERIC ERNEST FARRINGTON, PH.D. New York: Macmillan, 1914. Pp. ix+258.

The significance of the nineteenth century for Germany may be found in the development of the national spirit and consciousness, and the response in the reorganization of the schools to serve the civic ideal. For the latter half of that century the remarkable thing is the transformation of Germany from an agricultural community to a great industrial and commercial nation. The response to this social transformation has hardly yet fully embodied itself in the schools of Germany. Great progress had, however, been made in that direction up to the moment of the outbreak of the present war. For the reorganization of education to meet the industrial situation the recent reports of Mr. Edwin G. Cooley, educational commissioner of the Commercial Club of Chicago, with the accompanying bibliographical references is probably the best easily available material. Professor Farrington's book is the latest word upon the situation in regard to commercial education in Germany. Those who are familiar with his book on the *Secondary Schools of France* will not be

disappointed in their expectation to find in the volume now under discussion a thoroughgoing and informing account of this subject.

The relation of the government to national commercial development "on the production side" is shown to consist of schools intended to take students at various levels and train them for specific types of service. There are (1) the higher schools, colleges of commerce, co-ordinate with the universities in that they presuppose the nine years' secondary-school training; (2) the secondary commercial schools, some of them sequent to and some parallel with a six years' (*Realschule*) course; and (3) the lower commercial schools to which the *Volksschule* is prerequisite. The colleges develop the manufacturer's experts, while the secondary and lower commercial schools train operatives of greater or less skill. Thus at every level at which a German youth may leave school there is provided an avenue to a commercial career suitable to his abilities and his attainments. Herein is found a specific expression of the general educational policy of Germany, namely, to "find out thoroughly what a lad is to do and then to train him specifically for that particular line of work and for no other."

The lowest level of commercial education is not reached until the boy has completed the elementary school (*Volksschule*) at fourteen. No "vocational" studies are introduced into the *Volksschule*. Herein one finds a point of difference between German and American schools. A German boy on leaving the elementary school at fourteen becomes an apprentice and for three or four years attends the continuation school or other vocational school where he "develops the theoretical and business aspects of his trade alongside his real work." Such attendance upon the continuation school is obligatory in twelve out of the twenty-six states, his employer being required by law to see that the boy attends the school for a certain number of hours each week. Payment of school fees is never exacted from pupils subject to the requirements of a compulsory attendance law. This is borne by the employer. The control of these schools is not vested in the Ministry of Education (*Kultusministerium*), but rather in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. The character of studies is influenced by the location of the school. In the great commercial centers pupils in the continuation schools are engaged in export and import trade. In the manufacturing centers they will be found in the offices of the industrial concerns.

The secondary commercial schools are of two general types: (1) commercial *Realschulen*; (2) commercial higher schools. In the former the commercial branches are incorporated in the curriculum of a *Realschule* (a six years' school). The latter, however, gives a two or three years' advanced course superimposed upon the six years' academic course. This higher school is a "purely professional commercial school whose sole interest is to prepare young men for active business life," especially for the more important positions in banking, export and import trade, and service abroad. The most elaborate system and greatest variety of secondary commercial schools are found in the city of Frankfurt.

The highest grade of commercial schools in Germany is the college of commerce (*Handelshochschule*). The completion of a nine years' course in an approved secondary school is prerequisite to admission. In this respect these institutions are on the same level with the universities. There are six of these schools in Germany, the oldest dating from 1898. The college at Cologne, regarded by Farrington as the "best representative of the German colleges of commerce," has a fourfold purpose: (1) to offer a thorough general and commercial education to those who expect to devote themselves to a commercial calling; (2) to give professional training to prospective commercial-school teachers; (3) to furnish young administrative and consular officials, secretaries of chambers of commerce, and the like, an opportunity for acquiring special mercantile information; and (4) to offer opportunities to practical merchants to render themselves more proficient. Women are admitted on equal terms with men.

NATHANIEL BUTLER

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Societal Evolution: A Study of the Evolutionary Basis of the Science of Society. By ALBERT GALLOWAY KELLER. New York: Macmillan, 1915. Pp. ix+338.

This study is a serious and thoughtful attempt to apply the Darwinian theory as developed in the field of biology to the phenomena of society. Discarding the philosophical implications of the doctrine, Professor Keller seeks to explain the growth, development, and persistence of mores in human society by application of the scientific formulae of variation, selection, transmission, and adaptation. The author believes that these factors are active in the life of societies as in the life of organisms. This central thought is an extension of the work of the late Professor Sumner, to whom the writer frequently refers and from whom he draws much illustrative material. The book merits thorough study by all who desire a clear working conception of the fundamentals of societal development from the evolutionary point of view.

LEONARD D. WHITE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A History of Mediaeval and Modern Europe, for Secondary Schools. By WILLIAM STEARNS DAVIS, assisted by NORMAN SHAW MCKENDRICK. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1914. Pp. 560.

This new text is evidently written to meet the demand for a course in European history covering in one year the period from the fall of Rome to the present time. It was no easy task to make a text that was something else than a lifeless epitome. The work of selection and the difficulties of clear statement were great, but the authors have been very successful, on the whole. Of course, as to selection and proportions, one may easily disagree. To cite one example:

English history from Charles II to Anne, inclusive, is given 13 pages; from 1714 to 1830 (without any treatment of the American Revolution), 17 pages; while the causes of the French Revolution, the period from 1789 to 1795, and that from 1795 to 1815 are given respectively 13, 29, and 34 pages. Again, as to the actors who take leading parts in the historical drama, would it not be better to give more detailed information about a smaller number and omit some, such as Abd. Rahman, Athaulf, and the Duke of Augustenberg, to select only three from one of the twenty-eight crowded index pages?

Maps and illustrations are abundant and excellent; the comments upon the latter are especially helpful. References might have been much more abundant than they are. In a book where the space available for illuminating details is so valuable, review questions based upon the text might be spared. The exercises (suggestive questions and topics) are good. A postscript of three pages gives an admirable statement of causes and events at the opening of the present European war.

ALBERT H. SANFORD

STATE NORMAL SCHOOL
LA CROSSE, WIS.

Methods of Teaching in High Schools. By SAMUEL CHESTER PARKER, Professor of Educational Methods and Dean of the College of Education of the University of Chicago. Chicago: Ginn & Co., 1914. Pp. xxiv+529. \$1.50 net.

It is evident from a mere riffling of the leaves of this volume that it is the fruit of experience. A second, rather careful riffling of the leaves will impress the reader at once with at least a half-dozen valuable characteristics, namely: the subject-matter, the clear logical arrangement of the subject-matter, the introductory and conclusive summaries of each chapter and groups of chapters, the carefully selected quotations from works of former and present-day educators, the complete and intelligent bibliographical notes at the end of each chapter, and the reasonableness and practicality of the entire book.

In his preface, Mr. Parker remarks that "efficiency and economy in instruction are facilitated by (1) radically adjusting all instruction to contemporary social needs, (2) basing methods of instruction on sound psychological principles which have been determined, as far as possible, experimentally, and (3) applying principles of scientific business management to the conduct of all teaching." And thus the portly, green volume, which appears rather formidable until one has read a paragraph or two into it, combines all of the idealism of Locke and Froebel and Herbart with the soundness and validity of everyday, businesslike instruction.

Stress is laid on methods of learning as a basis for the discussion of methods of teaching. Well-established, scientific conclusions and valid experimental determinations, as well as expert opinion, are ably marshaled in working out

methods of instruction and in presenting the applications of principles of teaching. It is always perfectly clear to the student of education when the writer is giving his own opinions in discussing moot questions. An excellent illustration of these points is found in chap. xiii, "Influence of Age on Learning"—a valuable chapter in itself also as a corrective to certain limited views and attractive opinions, quite generally accepted, in respect to types of learning and the sequence of subjects and interests in dealing with problems of organization and instruction.

The author's style is clear, logical, non-technical, and scholarly. A wide and fruitful familiarity with the literature of his profession is shown in every chapter. The human, businesslike qualities of the writer grip the attention and the reader is invited to read on. The theoretical discussion strikes one as eminently sound. The value of applying to high-school instruction the same general principles that have been applied so fruitfully to the consideration of elementary-school methods will be increasingly recognized by supervisors, administrators, and high-school teachers.

This volume will prove valuable, not only as a textbook in classes in educational methods for prospective high-school teachers, but also for all high-school teachers desiring to improve their teaching and for superintendents and principals who are seeking a definite type of study for the professional improvement of their instructional staff.

A brief summarizing statement of the contents of the book may not be out of place:

Beginning with a chapter on the purposes to be attained by high-school instruction, the author follows it immediately by a chapter on economy in classroom activity and the attainment of ends without the waste of time or energy. Then follow standards to guide the selection and arrangement of subjects and subject-matter within them; the best methods from the viewpoint of economy and efficiency of learning to be used in those subjects. He discusses ways and means of stimulating pupils to learn without wasted time or energy, providing for individual differences in class instruction so that each pupil as an individual may go his own pace, and providing supervision of study so that there will be a minimum of effort that fans the air. Then are considered the various means of instruction or sources of learning—learning being, of course, experience enrichment—and so books, writing, recitations, and reference methods, the pupils' experiences, present and past, involving laboratory and conversational methods, are discussed. Finally, with the equipment and training of new teachers in mind, the author speaks of the planning of instruction with both ideals and economy in view so that definite and valuable experience will be provided; the testing and meaning of teaching, and finally the organized observation of teaching as essential to show the application to educational theory.

H. L. MILLER

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Educational Psychology: Briefer Course. By EDWARD L. THORNDIKE.
New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1915.
Pp. 442. \$2.00.

The notable characteristics of Professor Thorndike's volume are its originality of treatment, directness of presentation, thorough lucidity, consistent interpretation—all qualities of first importance in the guiding function of a textbook. The student will know precisely what sections of the mental domain have been surveyed, what conclusions are available, what methods legitimate. It is the business of the instructor to supply the general scheme of the mind's dominion, and to relate the problems treated to the totality of considerations that the life of the mind in its practical aspects richly presents.

The volume is composed of three parts, each part the condensation of an independent volume in the larger work of which this is the "briefer course." The first considers the original nature of man, and gives altogether the best statement available of the inherent impulses which constitute the human endowment. The genetic view dominates, and tendencies are related to bits of behavior for the sake of which they exist. Jointly they build up an orderly mental control, that begins with the first reactions to experience and differs only in complexity and intricacy of pattern in the higher reaches of the triumphs of problem-solving in science and practice. It is inevitable that the ordinary "popular" view of psychological function is directed to concrete mechanisms that have proved to be a part of the fitness for the work of the world as artificially organized. The corrective of a psychological analysis reduces these aptitudes to the underlying adjustments of function to situation, according to the "behaviorist" program. Education does not create powers but only directs them, and is most distinctive in the selection of material which it chooses to emphasize as valuable. The small human stock in trade—the original nature of man—represents a rudimentary equipment (mainly of an emotional order) fitted to the earliest stages of "humanity," and adjusting it helpfully in terms of "satisfiers" and "annoyers." The potent transformation of impulses through the social enlargement contributes the vital touch; and through its expansion and by-products man matures. Theories of interpretation of the evolutionary course of mind are discussed; the "utility" theory is supported and the "recapitulation" theory refuted.

That this body of considerations is the proper starting-point for an educational psychology is unmistakable; its warrant consists in the illumination which it affords. It gives a sense of realism to the workings of the mind which is an excellent antidote to the "mythical" and abstract conceptions so tempting to the descriptive psychologist and the system-maker. Yet the result is often bare and seemingly wooden; it is simple and strenuous and direct, while the life of the mind seems complex and gentle and evasive. None the less the skeleton is the structural basis, however much our interest is confined to the flesh-and-blood investiture, to say nothing of the artificial appearance. The

impression of the book remains that definiteness of result has been sacrificed to significance of perspective. Samples as samples are not likely to mislead; but with the attention upon samples and not upon the "total" product thus sampled, the student may carry away a false notion of the psychological setting. That a competent and discerning teacher can relieve this danger goes without saying.

The central portion of the book is concerned with the problem of learning. The analogies between animal learning and human learning are admirably drawn. Tables and curves are in such investigations truly samples, though their significance varies with the quality of the acquisition. Problems of practice and fatigue and the interrelation of the supporting parts of a composite activity are generic, and in any wise selection typical. Since so much of the business of education is centered in the learning process, its central place in psychological analysis is doubly warranted. A future edition will doubtless extend the varieties of learning to the orders of acquisition to which the psychologist is now giving suggestive study.

The concluding section deals with the individual differences of men. The central problems are the references of such differences to heredity and to environment: to sex, and race, and immediate ancestry and again to the emphases, the encouragements and discouragements of the environment. This is in many respects the most interesting phase of practical psychology and one that forms the actual pivot of national and international contrasts. The data of sex and ancestry are in certain directions available, and the conclusions readily drawn; those of race are far more uncertain. Professor Thorndike has made a temperate and discerning statement of the significance of the facts in the case. He has wisely abandoned the more literal manner of the earlier divisions and given himself scope to indicate suggestively what cannot be determined experimentally. The temper of his conclusions is indicated in such statements as the following:

We may even expect that education will be doubly effective, once society recognizes the advantages given to some and denied to others by heredity. That men have different amounts of capacity does not imply any the less advantage from or need of wise investment. If it be true, for example, that the negro is by nature unintellectual and joyous, this does not imply that he may not be made more intelligent by wiser training or misanthropic and ugly-tempered by the treatment he now receives. It does mean that we should be stupid to expect the same results from him that we should from an exceptionally intellectual race like the Jews, and that he will stand with equanimity a degree of disdain which a Celt would requite with dynamite and arson.

The volume is sustained, not alone by unity of purpose and command of material, but equally by an exceptionable gift for clear statement and apt illustration. It is never dull, though inevitable, realistic. Its place in the available resources for the teaching of psychology is well at the top, though its limitations of plan assign it to a definite aim and clientèle.

JOSEPH JASTROW

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

BOOK-NOTES

SNOWDEN, PHILIP, M. P. *Socialism and Syndicalism*. (The Nation's Library Series.) Baltimore: Warwick & York. Pp. 262.

A sensible volume devoted mainly to an exposition of the foundations of socialism and to an indication of the roads leading to its fulfilment. It includes a short comparison of the doctrines of socialism with those of syndicalism. The author makes a very persuasive statement of the foundations of socialism, and a very moderate statement of the ways in which it must fulfil itself. Those accustomed to classify socialism with anarchism, feminism, syndicalism, and many other isms would do well to clarify their ideas by a perusal of at least the earlier chapters of this book. We feel bound to add, however, that if the author's views were destined to no longer life than the publisher's bindings, none but the careful reader could hope to become familiar with them.

BURROWS, H. L. *English Industry and Trade*. London: A. & C. Black, 1915. Pp. vi+208.

A brief presentation of the growth and development of English economic life from pre-Conquest times to the present day. The book is written in a simple, direct, entertaining manner, contains a surprising amount of material, and in every way is splendidly adapted for either secondary-school or introductory college work in industrial history. The treatment of manorial organization deserves special commendation as a clear non-technical discussion of a difficult question.

La Instrucción Publica Primaria en la Republica Oriental del Uruguay. Montevideo: A. Barreiro y Romeo, 1914. Pp. 83+79.

In Spanish and English; written for the San Francisco Exposition.

PING WEN KUO. *The Chinese System of Public Education*. (Contributions to Education, No. 64.) New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1915. Pp. xii+209. \$1.50.

LEWIS, HARRY R. *Poultry Keeping*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1915. Pp. xviii+365.

An excellent treatise for country high schools.

KELLEY, TRUMON LEE. *Educational Guidance. An Experimental Study in the Analysis and Prediction of Ability of High School Pupils*. (Contributions to Education, No. 71.) New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1915. Pp. 116. \$2.00.

ELLIOTT, CHARLES H. *Variation in the Achievements of Pupils*. (Contributions to Education, No. 72.) New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1915. Pp. 114. \$1.25.

ALDERMAN, L. R. *School Credit for Home Work*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1915. Pp. x+181. \$1.00.

The virtue of this book is that it presents evidence, good, sound, wholesome, human evidence, facts that you can take up and handle. And all the evidence bears on the title. This book is a human document and not an educational blue-print.

SHUSTER, EDGAR. *Eugenics*. Baltimore: Warwick & York, 1912. (The Nation's Library.) Pp. 264. \$0.40.

A sketch of the history of the movement, and a presentation of the problem for popular consumption.

POLAK, S., and QUILTER, H. C. *The Teaching of Drawing*. Baltimore: Warwick & York. 2d ed. Pp. 168. \$0.85.

With diagrams and plates.

CHAPMAN, J. CROSBY. *Individual Difference in Ability and Improvement and Their Correlation*. (Contributions to Education, No. 63.) New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1914. Pp. 45. \$0.75.

BRONNER, AUGUSTA F. *A Comparative Study of the Intelligence of Delinquent Girls*. (Contributions to Education, No. 68.) New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1914. Pp. 95. \$1.00.

HOLLINGWORTH, LETA S. *Functional Periodicity*. (Contributions to Education, No. 69.) New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1914. Pp. 101. \$1.00.

KELLY, F. J. *Teachers' Marks, Their Variability and Standardization*. (Contributions to Education, No. 66.) New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1914. Pp. 139. \$1.50.

A study of standards of marking in elementary schools, high schools, and colleges, and of the marking of examination papers, and an analysis of standard texts as aids in standardization.

WILD, LAURA H. *Geographic Influences in Old Testament Masterpieces*. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1915. Pp. xiii+182. \$1.00.

Not the geography of Palestine, but a geographical interpretation of the Bible.

THOMPSON, FRANK V. *Commercial Education in Public Secondary Schools*. (School Efficiency Series.) Yonkers-on-Hudson: World Book Co., 1915. Pp. xii+194.

An argument for the reorganization of commercial education in the schools.

WESNER, E. W., and BYLER, J. FRANK. *Profitable Vocations for Boys*. New York: A. S. Barnes Co., 1915. Pp. viii+282. \$1.00.

An excellent attempt to give advice to unknown people.

GREER, EDITH. *Food, What It Is and Does*. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1915. Pp. vii+251. \$1.00.

An elementary text for schools and home use.

HITCHCOCK, ALFRED M. *Words, Sentences or Paragraphs*. A Drill Book. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1915. Pp. 239.

Fourteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part I, Minimum Essentials in Elementary-School Subjects. Standards and Current Practices. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1915. Pp. 162. \$0.75.

- STEWART, ROLLAND MACLAREN. *Co-operative Methods in the Development of School Support in the United States*. Iowa City: State University of Iowa, 1914. Pp. 161. Paper.
- STERN, WILLIAM. *The Psychological Methods of Testing Intelligence*. Translated from the German by GUY MONTROSE WHIPPLE. (Educational Psychology Monographs.) Baltimore: Warwick & York, 1914. Pp. vii+160. \$1.25.
- DAVIDSON, PERCY E. *The Recapitulation Theory and Human Infancy*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1915. Pp. 105. \$1.00.
- WINCH, W. H. *Children's Perceptions*. Baltimore: Warwick & York, 1915. Pp. x+246. \$1.50.
An experimental study, No. 12, of the Educational Psychology series.
- RENME, JOHN. *The Aims and Methods of Nature Study*. Baltimore: Warwick & York, 1915. 3d ed. Pp. 368. \$1.10.
A book of methods for a class in the teaching of nature-study.
- MURRAY, E. R. *Froebel as a Pioneer in Modern Psychology*. Baltimore: Warwick & York, 1914. Pp. 224. \$1.25.
- KELLOGG, VERNON LYMAN, and DOONE, RENNIE WILBUR. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1915. Pp. x+532.
An attempt at a "practical" zoölogy for students beginning their study of animal life.
- COPE, HENRY F. *Religious Education in the Family*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1915. Pp. xii+298. \$1.25.
- THOMAS, MAY (ED.). *Hans Arnold's Menne in Seebad*. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1915. Pp. iii+102.
Exercises, notes, and vocabulary, besides the text.
- SHEIP, STANLEY S. (ED.). *Handbook of the European War*. Bibliography by CORINNE BACON. Handbook Series. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1914. Pp. vii+334.
A further addition to the multitude of unnecessary books concerning the great war. All the information included in the book is easily obtainable elsewhere. The volume contains a chronology of events to October 31, 1914, and a map of the war area.
- KÖRTE, ALFRED. *Die griechische Komödie*. [Aus Natur und Geisteswelt.] Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. Pp. 104. M. 1.
A handbook which presents in popular form the development of Greek comedy. Those who read German will find it an excellent survey, at once scholarly and interesting.
- TAUER, PAUL. *Das Altertum im Leben der Gegenwart*. [Aus Natur und Geisteswelt.] Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1915. Pp. 131. M. 1.
An attempt to trace the various influences of classical cultures on modern civilization, with special reference to Germany. A bibliography of German writers in this field is added. Second edition.

CURRENT EDUCATIONAL LITERATURE IN THE PERIODICALS¹

IRENE WARREN

Librarian, School of Education, University of Chicago

- Ayres, Leonard P. School surveys. *School and Society* 1:577-81. (24 Ap. '15.)
- Bardwell, Darwin L. Phases of the work of a modern high school. *Educa. R.* 49:367-78. (Ap. '15.)
- Bliss, D. C. Open window classes. *Psychol. Clinic* 9:29-38. (Ap. '15.)
- Bonser, F. G. Berea, an example of American educational ideals. *School and Society* 1:597-601. (24 Ap. '15.)
- Bowden, Witt. Education for power and responsibility. *Educa. R.* 49:352-66. (Ap. '15.)
- Butler, Nicholas Murray. Concerning some matters academic. *Educa. R.* 49:391-99. (Ap. '15.)
- Carrington, W. T. The study of education in a normal school. *School and Society* 1:477-81. (3 Ap. '15.)
- Chancellor, William E. Written examinations: the scientific view. *J. of Educa. (Bost.)* 81:451-56. (29 Ap. '15.)
- Collins, Joseph V. The chief aim in education. *Educa.* 35:522-28. (Ap. '15.)
- Cooley, Edwin G. Welfare of working youth in Germany. *Educa. R.* 49:337-51. (Ap. '15.)
- Coons, Charles S. The teaching of science to children in the Gary public schools. *School and Society* 1:546-52. (17 Ap. '15.)
- Dennett, Mary Ware. The right of a child to two parents. *Cent.* 90:104-8. (My. '15.)
- (The) Department of Superintendence. *Am. School* 1:102. (Ap. '15.)
- Evans, Frederick H. The essence of success in evening vocational work. *School and Society* 1:593-97. (24 Ap. '15.)
- Flower, Elliott. Sounding the retreat. *Harp. W.* 60:417-18. (1 My. '15.)

¹ Abbreviations.—*Am. School*, American School; *Atlan.*, Atlantic Monthly; *Cent.*, Century; *Educa.*, Education; *Educa. R.*, Educational Review; *El. School J.*, Elementary School Journal; *English J.*, English Journal; *Harp. W.*, Harper's Weekly; *J. of Educa. (Bost.)*, Journal of Education (Boston); *Man. Train. and Voca. Educa.*, Manual Training and Vocational Education; *Pop. Sci. Mo.*, Popular Science Monthly; *Psychol. Clinic*, Psychological Clinic; *R. of Rs.*, Review of Reviews; *School R.*, School Review; *Sci. Am.*, Scientific American; *Sci. Am. Sup.*, Scientific American Supplement.

- Freeman, Frank N. An analytical scale for judging handwriting. *El. School J.* 15:432-41. (Ap. '15.)
- Gardner, Lucy M. Training children to read good literature. *English J.* 4:248-53. (Ap. '15.)
- Graham, Edward Kidder. Inaugural address at the University of North Carolina. *School and Society* 1:613-21. (1 My. '15.)
- Gruenberg, Benjamin C. Why vocational guidance? *Sci. Am. Sup.* 79:275. (1 My. '15.)
- Haight, Harry W. The case system of teaching hygiene and preventive medicine in the upper grades. *Educa. R.* 49:503-9. (My. '15.)
- Haniphy, Joseph A. Juvenile courts. *Educa. R.* 49:489-502. (My. '15.)
- Heck, W. H. The mission of universities and colleges in stimulating the development of an esprit de corps among high school students. *School and Society* 1:541-46. (17 Ap. '15.)
- Hicks, Frederick C. Library problems in American universities. *Educa. R.* 49:325-36. (Ap. '15.)
- Horton, D. W. A plan of vocational guidance. *School R.* 23:236-43. (Ap. '15.)
- Hosic, James Fleming. The essentials of composition and grammar. *School and Society* 1:581-87. (24 Ap. '15.)
- Jones, Adam Leroy. Memoranda from the records of a few college freshmen. *School and Society* 1:626-30. (1 My. '15.)
- Jungmann, A. M. Teaching defective children. *Sci. Am.* 112:361. (17 Ap. '15.)
- Lull, Herbert G. Vocational instruction in the high school. *Man. Train. and Voca. Educa.* 16:529-36. (My. '15.)
- Manny, Frank A. Initiative in education. *Educa.* 35:489-90. (Ap. '15.)
- Marrinan, J. J. The education of youth for democracy. *Educa. R.* 49:379-90. (Ap. '15.)
- Miller, H. L. Report on the sixty-minute class period in the Wisconsin high school. *School R.* 23:244-48. (Ap. '15.)
- Mitchell, H. Edwin. Time-articulation between high school and college. *School R.* 23:217-24. (Ap. '15.)
- Moore, Ernest C. The administration of the public schools of New York City. *Educa. R.* 49:469-88. (My. '15.)
- Newton, Peter. The toy theater: a children's playhouse where fairy tales come true. *Craftsman* 28:36-41. (Ap. '15.)
- Otis, Margaret. Moral imbecility from a respectable family. *Psychol. Clinic* 9:51-55. (Ap. '15.)
- Owen, William Bishop. Vocational education in Illinois; the contest. *Am. School* 1:99-102. (Ap. '15.)
- Pearse, C. G. Gary; the city which has seen a great light. *Am. School* 1:104-7. (Ap. '15.)

